National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

NL-339 (r. 88/04) c

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

DYMYTRIJ TUPTALO'S UKRAINIAN SERMONS - A STUDY IN KIEVAN RHETORIC

BY

DUSHAN BEDNARSKY (C)

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS
IN
UKRAINIAN LITERATURE

DEPARTMENT OF SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES
EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL 1991

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-70242-7

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: **DUSHAN BEDNARSKY**
TITLE OF THESIS: **DYMYTRIJ TUPTALO'S UKRAINIAN SERMONS - A STUDY IN KIEVAN RHETORIC**
DEGREE: **MASTER OF ARTS IN UKRAINIAN LITERATURE**
YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: **1991**

PERMISSION IS HEREBY GRANTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY TO REPRODUCE SINGLE COPIES OF THIS THESIS AND TO LEND OR SELL SUCH COPIES FOR PRIVATE, SCHOLARLY OR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH PURPOSES ONLY.

THE AUTHOR RESERVES OTHER PUBLICATION RIGHTS, AND NEITHER THE THESIS NOR EXTENSIVE EXTRACTS FROM IT MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED WITHOUT THE AUTHOR'S WRITTEN PERMISSION.

D. Bednarsky

501, 9909 Bellamy Hill
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2B1 CANADA

Date: Oct. 11, 1991

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled DYMYTRIJ TUPTALO'S UKRAINIAN SERMONS: A STUDY IN KIEVAN RHETORIC submitted by DUSHAN BEDNARSKY in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF ARTS in UKRAINIAN LITERATURE.

Peter A. Rolland, supervisor

Andrij Hornjatkevyč

Frank Sysyn

Natalia Pylypiuk

26 September 1991

Abstract

My thesis is an analysis of eight Ukrainian sermons by Dymytrij Tuptalo (St. Dimitrij, Metropolitan of Rostov) based on the Renaissance interpretation of Classical rhetoric and the homiletical theory of Ioannykij Galjatovs'kyj. Chapter One is an overview of Classical oratory with special emphasis on the theory of epideictic, or ceremonial speech as presented in the works of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian. Chapter Two is a brief summary of Galjatovs'kyj's theory of homiletics with attention given to Classical sources and to Christian elements within this theory. Chapter Three is a short biography of Dymytrij Tuptalo which highlights his training in rhetoric and his career as a preacher. Chapter Four is an analysis of the sermons which demonstrates the author's faithful adherence to the principles of Classical rhetoric as articulated in Renaissance schools, and his close affinity with Galjatovs'kyj's theory of sermon writing. I conclude that Tuptalo's sermons reveal a sound background in Classical oratory and an indebtedness to Galjatovs'kyj's homiletical theory.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the people who assisted me with my thesis: P. Rolland, N. Pylypiuk, A. Hornjatkevyč, and F. Sysyn.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER ONE
THE CLASSICAL TRADITION 5

CHAPTER TWO
KLIUC RAZUMENIJA 19

CHAPTER THREE
BIOGRAPHY OF DYMYTRIJ TUTPALO 36

CHAPTER FOUR
TUPTALO'S UKRAINIAN SERMONS 46

BIBLIOGRAPHY 74

APPENDIX 81

Introduction

The art of the sermon, despite its long and notable contribution to European literature, remains virtually untouched by Ukrainian literary criticism. From the dawn of Christianity, until the end of the Baroque, the sacred oration occupied a prominent position in the belletristic literature of Christian Europe. It is only comparatively recently, during the last two centuries, that the sermon has fallen out of the realm of belles-lettres, and consequently, the study of this form of literature has remained sadly neglected. The fate of the sermon in East Slavic literature has been no kinder. We need not be reminded that the art of the sermon flourished in Kiev Rus', with sacred orations of significant literary value being authored by such individuals as Metropolitan Ilarion of Kiev and Cyril of Turov, only to decline with the disintegration of the Kievan state. After experiencing a revival during the Renaissance, and reaching a dazzling climax during the Baroque, the art of sermon writing in Eastern Europe declined, eventually disappearing as a form of artistic expression altogether.

The art of the sermon flourished throughout Europe during the highly religious milieu of the Baroque. The European Baroque was a cultural movement characterized by Christian mysticism and a Theocentric world view;[1] it is only natural that artistic expression would find a powerful voice in the form of sacred oration. The Ukrainian Baroque was even more profoundly influenced, and in fact dominated by the Church.[2] The concentration of intellectual activity in monasteries and in the schools attached to them, along with the atmosphere of extreme religiosity which characterized the conflict between Orthodox and Uniates in Ukraine, provided the extremely fertile ground in which this art form was to

---

[1]For a summary of Christian elements in Baroque spirituality, see Jean Krynen, "Aperçus sur le Baroque et la Théologie Spirituelle." Baroque Revue Internationale 1 (1963): 27-35.

[2]Dmytro Čyževs'kyj, in his A History of Ukrainian Literature, (Littleton: Ukrainian Academic Press, 1975) 263, proposes that one of the unique characteristics of Ukrainian Baroque is the predominance of religious over secular elements.
Riccardo Picchio, in "The Impact of Ecclesiastic Culture on Old Russian Literary Techniques." Medieval Russian Culture, ed. Henrik Birnbaum and Michael Flier (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984) 249, also proposes that Christian doctrine, biblical and patristic models, and, in general, church culture played a dominant role in the in the development of Medieval East Slavic literature.

flourish. The leading literary figures of the Ukrainian Baroque were almost without exception drawn from members of the clergy, who received training in rhetoric and systematic theology. Not only were clerics the major producers of literature during this period, they were also the primary consumers: literature was produced by monastic clergy, for the consumption of other monastics, for the students who attended the monasteries' schools, as well as for the various patrons and faithful who visited these institutions and attended Divine Services in the monastery churches. It is not surprising, therefore, that the art of sermon writing in Ukraine reached its zenith in the seventeenth century, achieving artistic heights that have not been equaled since.

In a cultural atmosphere which treasured well written sermons, one author stands out above others, Dymytrij Tuptalo (St. Dimitrij, Metropolitan of Rostov). Having been trained in rhetoric at the Kiev Collegium, he was called to preach early in life. The most productive years of his life were spent in his work as a "kaznodij" (preacher), preaching sermons in various locations throughout Ukraine, Lithuania, and Belorussia. Although later in life he became occupied in other activities, his first calling was to preach, and it is as a preacher that he was recognized during his own lifetime.

Tuptalo is one of the finest representatives of Ukrainian sermon writers. Therefore it is not surprising that Tuptalo's Ukrainian sermons merit special attention. Unfortunately, very little of what Tuptalo wrote survives in the Ukrainian Baroque vernacular; most of his works are to be found in Church Slavonic translations. During this period, it was customary throughout the Orthodox Slavic world for published sermons to appear in Church Slavonic instead of the vernacular. Orthodox writers not only glorified Church Slavonic as the *lingua sacra* of the Church,[3] but also praised this language as the international language of communication used by all the Orthodox Slavic peoples.[4] Thus, the preference for Church Slavonic over the vernacular for the publishing of books was due not only

---

[3]Bohdan Strumins'kyj, "Pre-nineteenth Century Ukrainian." Apects of the Slavic Language Question, vol. 2, ed. Riccardo Picchio and Harvey Goldblatt (Columbus: Slavica Publishers, 1984) 16.

[4]Strumins'kyj 17.

to aesthetic reasons, but also to make these works accessible to as many readers as possible throughout the Orthodox Slavic world.

Church Slavonic dominated Orthodox worship in Ukraine, despite the fact that most Ukrainians found it difficult to understand. The use of the vernacular was forbidden in Church books, except for those which were of a strictly instructional nature (i.e. catechisms, scriptural commentaries, Saints' Lives).[5] The language of worship was Church Slavonic, the only exception being made for the delivery of sermons, which was permitted in the vernacular. Consequently, sermon writing offered Churchmen a rare opportunity to demonstrate their skill in "word-mastery" ("xitroslovie") using the *lingua vulgara* ("prostyj jazyk").

Fortunately, a handful of Tuptalo's Ukrainian sermons survive in the vernacular, and these sermons are the subject of this thesis.[6] These Ukrainian sermons are unique examples of Tuptalo's sacred orations, surviving in the original tongue in which they were preached. Although Tuptalo's masterful command of Church Slavonic is unquestionable, his Ukrainian sermons offer a rare glimpse into the personality of a writer who was born and raised in Ukraine, spent most of his life in Ukraine, preaching to Ukrainians, and speaking the Ukrainian language.

The aim of this thesis is to place these sermons within the rhetorical tradition of Ukrainian Baroque literature. It will be seen that Ukrainian Baroque rhetoric is essentially a reworking of the Renaissance concepts of Classical rhetoric, based on a reinterpretation of the works of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian. Specifically, Ukrainian Baroque sermon writing draws from one particular element of the Classical tradition, namely the theory of epideictic, or demonstrative oration, based primarily upon Aristotle and Quintilian. The study of rhetoric in Ukrainian schools was primarily intended for the writing of sermons and homilies. Consequently, Ukrainian Rhetoric is Classical in form; while its context is Christian. This Christianization of classical rhetoric is evident in the principal handbook for rhetoric produced in Ukraine during this period, Ioannykij

---

[5]Strumins'kyj 26.

[6]The text of these sermons is found in Andrej Titov's Propovědi Svjatitelja Dimitrija, Mitropolita Rostovskago, na ukrainskom narěčii (Moskva [Moscow]: 1909). All quotations from Tuptalo's text will be given according to page number from Titov's redaction.

Galjatovs'kyj's Ključ razuměnija,[7] containing his tract on homiletics, "Nauka, albo sposob zloženja kazanja". Galjatovs'kyj's discourse on homiletics became the basis upon which sacred orators of the second half of the seventeenth century in Ukraine crafted their works. Among the preachers who utilized an approach to sermon writing which closely followed Galjatovs'kyj's interpretation of Classical rhetoric, was Dymytrij Tuptalo. Thus, a continuous flow of thought extends from the original rhetorical theory of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, which then proceeds into Galjatovs'kyj's "Nauka, albo sposob zloženja kazanja", and finally emerges in Tuptalo's sermons. By looking at the principles of rhetoric, based on ancient sources, and how they were presented in the rhetorical methodology of Galjatovsk'yj, we may see the Ukrainian Baroque approach to sermon writing as displayed in the Ukrainian sermons of Dymytrij Tuptalo.

Chapter one of this thesis will introduce the five-fold division of classical rhetoric and give an overview of the theory of epideictic oration based on the works of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian. The second chapter will examine the homiletical theory of Ioannykij Galjatovs'kyj as presented in his "Nauka, albo sposob zloženja kazanja". Chapter three will include a short biography of Dymytrij Tuptalo, a history of the sermons which are the subject of this research, and a systematic analysis of these texts demonstrating the practical application of rhetorical theory in the art of Ukrainian Baroque sermon writing.

---

[7]This thesis uses the International System of transliteration for Church Slavonic, Middle Ukrainian, and the modern languages using the Cyrillic alphabet. This is the system adhered to by the Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature. Transliteration is based on the actual source cited. For example, all transliterated quotations from Tuptalo's Ukrainian sermons are according to Titov's Russian text; thus the Cyrillic "г" is transliterated as "g", rather than "h".

Chapter One: The Classical Tradition

Classical orators classified speeches according to three types and divided rhetorical theory into five fields of study. The three types of speech were deliberative, forensic, and epideictic oratory, and the five areas of rhetorical study were known as *inventio* , *dispositio* , *elocutio* , *memoria* , and *pronuntiatio* . While epideictic speech shares a number of features in common with deliberative and forensic oratory, it also possesses many unique characteristics of its own, particulary in regard to aim, method of persuasion, time, object of speech, structure, rhythm, ornamentation, and amplification. In order to understand the classical approach to ceremonial speech, it is first necessary to understand its place within the broader realm of rhetoric in general, and then analyze its distinguishing features.

The division of rhetoric into the three types of deliberative, forensic, and epideictic was first articulated by Aristotle in his Rhetoric.[8] Deliberative oratory (συμβουλευτικόν) was defined by Aristotle as the political or advisory speech of parliamentary assemblies in which the speaker urges his listeners to do or not to do something.[9] Forensic oratory (δικανικόν) describes the legal discourse which takes place in law courts,[10] and epideictic (ἐπιδεικτικόν) is the demonstrative oratory of display, suitable for ceremonial occasions.[11]

The classification of rhetoric into these three types is similarly presented in the rhetorical handbooks of Cicero and Quintilian,[12] who describe these three fields as *genus deliberativum* (deliberative oratory), *genus iudicale* (judicial oratory), and *genus demonstrativum* (epideictic, or

---

[8]Aristotle, Rhetoric (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1976). Also: Aristotle, Rhetoric to Alexander (London: William Heinemann, 1936); Edward Cope, The Rhetoric of Aristotle with a Commentary (Cambridge: 1877).

[9]Aristotle, Rhetoric (1358b 9): συμβουλῆς δὲ τὸ μὲν προτροπὴ τὸ δὲ ἀποτροπή ἀεὶ γὰρ καὶ οἱ ἰδίᾳ συμβουλεύοντες καὶ οἱ κοινῇ δημηγοροῦντες τούτων θάτερον ποιοῦσιν.

[10]Aristotle, Rhetoric (1358b 10): δίκης δὲ τὸ μὲν κατηγορία τὸ δ' ἀπολογία τούτων γὰρ ὁποτερονοῦν ποιεῖν ἀνάγκη τοὺς ἀμφισβητοῦντας.

[11]Aristotle, Rhetoric (1358b 12): ἐπιδεικτικοῦ δὲ τὸ μὲν ἔπαινος τὸ δὲ ψόγος.

[12]Cicero, De inventione (London: William Heinemann, 1959); Cicero, Orator (Cambridge, 1885); Cicero, Rhetorica ad Herennium (London: Harvard University Press, 1954); Cicero, Topica (London: William Heinemann, 1959); Quintilian, Institutio oratoria (London: William Heinemann, 1952).

demonstrative oratory).[13] Cicero defined the epideictic as being devoted to the praise and censure of a particular individual, the deliberative as pertaining to a political debate and involving the expression of an opinion, and the judicial as belonging in a court of law and involving accusation and defense.[14] Quintilian similarly divided rhetoric into three kinds of oratory, which he described as kinds of causes (*genera causarum*)[15] and identified them as panegyric, deliberative, and forensic.[16]

The three kinds of speech shared in common the traditional five-fold division of rhetoric into *inventio* , *dispositio* , *elocutio*, *memoria* , and *pronuntiatio*. *Inventio* (εὕρεσις) is, according to Aristotle, "what the means of persuasion are to be".[17] Cicero identifies *inventio* with *prudenter* , meaning "the wise forecast of the whole",[18] and he clearly defines *inventio* as "the discovery of valid or seemingly valid arguments to render one's cause plausible",[19] Quintilian's definition of *inventio* is similar to Aristotle's, calling it the discovery of all extrinsic means of persuasion; furthermore, his definition suggests that this is to be accomplished through the survey of the material and a forecast of the whole.[20] Thus, *inventio* is understood as the preparational state preceeding the composition of a speech, in which a survey is made of the resources available to the orator, and various arguments are proposed by which the speaker may achieve his aim.

---

[13]Cicero, De inventione (I v 7): in generibus rerum versari rhetoris officum putavit, demonstrativo, deliberativo, iudicali.

[14]Cicero, De inventione (I v 7): demonstrativum est quod tribuitur in alicuius certae personae laudem aut vituperationem; deliberativum, quod positum in disceptatione civili habet in se sententiae dictionem; iudiciale, quod positum in iudicio habet in se accusationem et defensionem aut petitionem et recusationem.

[15]Quintilian (III iii 15).

[16]Quintilian (III iii 14): videntur autem mihi, qui haec opera dixerunt, eo quoque moti, quod in alia rursus divisione nollent in idem nomen incidere, partes enim rhetorices esse dicebant laudativam, deliberativam, iudicalem.

[17]Aristotle, Rhetoric (1403b 5): ἐπειδὴ τρία ἐστὶν ἃ δεῖ πραγματευθῆναι περὶ τὸν λόγον, ἓν μὲν ἐκ τίνων αἱ πίστεις ἔσονται.

[18]Charles Baldwin, Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic (Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1959) 42.

[19]Cicero, De inventione (I vii 9): inventio est excogitatio rerum verarum aut veri similium quae causam probabilem reddant.

[20]Baldwin 67.

Dispositio (τάξις) is understood by Aristotle as "the arrangement, sequence, or movement in the large of a speech".[21] The Ciceronian definition of dispositio is that of "the distribution of arguments thus discovered in the proper order".[22] Cicero's definition identifies *dispositio* with *composite* , meaning skill in arrangement.[23] Quintilian's explanation points out that *dispositio* (or *collocatio*) refers not to the arrangement of individual details, but to the plan of the whole.[24]

Under the category of *dispositio* are included the various *partes oratoriae*, or different parts of an individual oration. The exact number of these parts varies according to the orator. Aristotle gives four: *exordium* , statement of facts, proof, and peroration.[25] Cicero identifies six parts: *exordium* , *narratio* , *partitio* , *confirmatio* , *refutatio* , and *peroratio* .[26] Quintilian identifies five: *exordium* (introduction), *narratio* (statement of facts), *excursus* (proposition), *confirmatio* (proof), and *peroratio* (conclusion).[27]

The *exordium* , which is identified by all three sources, is the introductory part of the speech. The purpose of the *exordium* is, according to Cicero, to attract the listeners' attention, and to secure their good will.[28] The *narratio* , or the statement of facts, is the exposition of events which have occurred or are supposed to have occurred.[29] *Partitio*, or *excursus* , is the section in which the orator puts forth, in a methodical way, the matters he wishes to discuss.[30] *Confirmatio* , or proof, is the part of the oration in which the orator defends his point through the use of

---

[21]Aristotle, Rhetoric (1403b 8): τρίτον δὲ πῶς χρὴ τάξαι τὰ μέρη τοῦ λόγου.

[22]Cicero, De inventione (I vii 9): dispositio est rerum inventarum in ordinem distributio.

[23]Baldwin 42.

[24]Baldwin 67.

[25]Baldwin 33.

[26]Cicero, De inventione (I xiv 19): eae partes sex esse omnino nobis videntur: exordium, narratio, partitio, confirmatio, reprehensio, conclusio.

[27]Quintilian (IV pr. 6): ordo explicetur: quod prohoemii sit officum, quae ratio narrandi, quae probationum fides, seu proposita confirmamus sive contra dicta dissolvimus, quanta vis in perorando.

[28]Cicero, De inventione (I xv 20): exordium est oratio animum auditoris idonee comperans ad reliquam dictionem: quod eveniet si eum benivolum, attentum, docilem confecerit.

[29]Cicero, De inventione (I xix 27): narratio est rerum gestarum aut ut gestarum expositio.

[30]Cicero, De inventione (I xxi 31): altera est in qua rerum earum de quibus erimus dicturi breviter expositio ponitur distributa.

arguments.[31] A second section dedicated to argumentation is included by Cicero under the name of *refutatio* , wherein the orator refutes opposing viewpoints by proposing counter-arguments.[32] *Peroratio* , the final part of oration, is the end or conclusion of the speech. According to Cicero, *peroratio* consists of three parts: the summing up of the ideas presented in the speech, the *indignatio* or arousing of ill-will against the opposing point of view, and the *conquestio* or arousing of sympathy for the orator's own viewpoint.[33]

Following *inventio* and *dispositio* , the third subject of the five-fold division of classical rhetoric is *elocutio* (λέξις).[34] In Aristotle's rhetoric, *elocutio* is understood as diction (arrangement of the speech) or, in a wider sense, style.[35] Cicero identifies *elocutio* with *ornate* , meaning "command of enhancing words"; the Ciceronian definition of *elocutio* involves "the fitting of proper language to the invented matter".[36] Cicero's concept of style, is based on *docere* , *delectare* , *movere* [37] and means that the orator's three objects are to prove, to please, and to move his listeners. In the Orator, Cicero associates these three objects with three differant styles: low style (*docere*), median style (*delectare*), and high style (*movere*).[38] Furthermore, according to Cicero's theory, the perfect orator must be master of all three styles; the three may be modified, combined, and varied (variety, in fact, being absolutely necessary).[39] Quintilian's definition of *elocutio* is associated with both *electio* (choice of words, including figures of speech) and *composite* (arrangement, but in

---

[31]Cicero, De inventione (I xxiv 34): Confirmatio est per quam argumentando nostrae causae fidem et auctoritatem et firmamentum adiungit oratio.

[32]Cicero, De inventione (I xlii 78): reprehensio est per quam argumentando adversariorum confirmatio diluitur aut infirmatur aut elevatur.

[33]Cicero, De inventione (I lii 98): conclusio est exitus et determinatio totius orationis. Haec habet partes tres: enumerationem, indignationem, conquestionem.

[34]Aristotle, Rhetoric (1403b 7): δεύτερον δὲ περὶ τὴν λέξιν.

[35]Baldwin 22.

[36]Cicero, De inventione (I vii 9): elocutio est idoneorum verborum ad inventionem accommodatio.

[37]Cicero, Orator (6): erit igitur eloquens - hunc enim autore Antonio quaerimus - is qui in foro causique civilibus ita dicet, ut probet, ut delectat, ut flectate.

[38]Baldwin 57.

[39]Baldwin 58.

details such as words, clauses, sentences, rhythm, harmony; sentence movement).[40]

Pronuntiatio (ὑπόκρισις) is concerned with delivery. Aristotle describes this as the analytic division of delivery into voice-placing and volume, pitch, and rhythm.[41] Cicero associates *pronuntiatio* with dignity of delivery (*cum actionis dignitate*) and defines this delivery as control of voice and body in a manner suitable to the dignity of the subject matter and style.[42] Under *pronuntiatio* , Quintilian includes the whole field of delivery, from the placing of the voice to the handling of the body.[43]

Memoria (μνήμη) is not mentioned at all in Book Three of Aristotle's Rhetoric; however, both Cicero and Quintilian mention the importance of being able to deliver unwritten speech on the basis of memory. Both Cicero and Quintilian describe *memoria* as the orator's whole command of his material in the order of his constructive plan and in relation to his rebuttal.[44]

The five-fold division of rhetoric into *inventio* , *dispositio* , *elocutio*, *memoria* , and *pronuntiatio* applies to all three types of speech: deliberative, forensic, and epideictic. Epideictic speech, however, possesses a number of features which distinguish it from deliberative and forensic rhetoric. In regard to aim and method of persuasion, time, object of speech, structure, rhythm, ornamentation, and amplification, ceremonial oration displays an abundance of variety and artistic freedom not found in other forms of oration.

Epideictic speech is firstly distinguished by its aim, or purpose. As is implied by its name (ἐπιδεικτικόν), this type of oration serves to prove, show, or demonstrate; for this reason, epideictic speech is also known as demonstrative rhetoric, or the ceremonial oratory of display. Aristotle's Rhetoric defines epideictic speech as the "ceremonial oratory of display

---

[40]Baldwin 67.

[41]Aristotle, Rhetoric (1403b 27): ἔστι δὲ αὐτὴ μὲν ἐν τῇ φωνῇ, πῶς αὐτῇ δεῖ χρῆσθαι πρὸς ἕκαστον πάθος, οἷον πότε μεγάλῃ καὶ πότε μικρᾷ καὶ μέσῃ, καὶ πῶς τοῖς τόνοις, οἷον ὀξείᾳ καὶ βαρείᾳ καὶ μέσῃ, καὶ ῥυθμοῖς τίσι πρὸς ἕκαστα.

[42]Cicero, De inventione (I vii 9): pronuntiatio est ex rerum et verborum dignitate vocis et corporis moderatio.

[43]Baldwin 67.

[44]Baldwin 42, 67.

which either praises or censures somebody."[45] Cicero defines epideictic speech as the praise or censure of a particular individual.[46] Quintilian explains that although all three forms of oratory devote themselves in part to a certain immediate matter, and in part to display, demonstrative, or epideictic oratory is considered the oratory of display because praise and blame demonstrate the nature of the object with which they are concerned.[47]

In regard to aim, Aristotle identifies two kinds of epideictic speech: eulogistic oratory, in which creditable purposes and actions are amplified, and vituperative oratory, in which discreditable purposes and actions are amplified, and creditable ones are minimalized.[48] Thus, speeches of praise fall under the category of eulogistic oratory.

Aristotle makes it clear that the three kinds of rhetoric (i.e. deliberative, forensic, and epideictic) work respectively toward their three aims and will not try to establish anything else.[49] Epideictic speech is not concerned with whether or not a specific act did or did not take place (this is the realm of forensic oratory), nor does it consider whether an individual's actions will be expedient or not (deliberative oratory); epideictic speech is solely concerned with giving praise or censure to the subject: Cicero emphasizes that above all, epideictic speech is concerned with honor, rather than fact.[50] In ceremonial speeches, the orator develops his case by arguing that what has been done is praiseworthy: the

---

[45]Aristotle, Rhetoric (1358b 12): ἐπιδεικτικοῦ δὲ τὸ μὲν ἔπαινος τὸ δὲ ψόγος.

[46]Cicero, De inventione (I v 7): demonstrativum est quod tributur in alicuius certae personae laudem aut vituperationem. See also the Rhetorica ad Herrenium (I i 2): demonstrativum est quod tribitur in alicuius certae personae laudem vel vituperationem.

[47]Quintilian (III iv 12): ut causarum quidem genera tria sint, sed ea tum in negotiis tum in ostentatione posita. Nisi forte non ex Graeco mutuantes demonstrativum vocant, verum id sequuntur, quod laus ac vituperatio quale sit quidque demonstrat.

[48]Aristotle, Rhetoric to Alexander (1425b 36): συλλήβδην μὲν οὖν ἔστι τὸ ἐγκωμιαστικόν εἶδος προαιρεσεῶν καὶ πράξεων καὶ λόγων ἐνδοξων αὔξησις καὶ μῆ προσοντῶν σύνοικειωσις, ψεκτικοῦ δὲ τὸ ἐναντιοῦ τούτω, τῶν μὲν ἐνδοξων ταπεινῶσις, τῶν δὲ αδοξῶν αὐξησις.

[49]Aristotle, Rhetoric (1358b 29): σημεῖον δ' ὅτι τὸ εἰρημένον ἑκάστοις τέλος περὶ μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἄλλων ἐνίοτε οὐκ ἂν ἀμφισβητησαιεν.

[50]Cicero, De inventione (II li 156): nam placet in demonstrativo genere finem esse honestatem. Also, Topica (xxiv 92): laudationis finis honestas.

facts themselves are to be taken on trust.[51] Quintilian explains that the topics of demonstrative oratory involve a qualitative basis; the facts are not disputed, only their quality is elaborated upon.[52] Aristotle gives the example that those who praise or censure a man do not consider whether his acts have been expedient or not, but make it a ground of actual praise that what he has done is to be considered honorable.[53]

The aim of a eulogistic oration is to praise, and the appropriate method of persuasion for such an oration is to convince the audience that the subject is worthy of praise. Aristotle identifies three modes of persuasion: the first kind depends on the personal character of the speaker, the second on putting the audience into a certain frame of mind, and the third on proof, or apparent proof, provided by the words of the speech.[54] According to Aristotle, epideictic speech requires the second method of persuasion[55] (i.e. the orator must make his hearers take the required view of his own character). The method by which the orator persuades his audience to take his point of view is by proving that the subject of the oration is worthy of honor; all considerations of the epideictic oration must be treated with reference to this one.[56] Quintilian similarly agrees that although the proper function of panegyric is to amplify and embellish,[57] a certain semblance of proof is at times required by speeches composed entirely for display.[58] Aristotle suggests interspersing the ceremonial oration with bits of episodic eulogy: the orator should speak of the virtue

---

[51]Aristotle, Rhetoric (1417b 30): ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐπιδεικτικοῖς τὸ πολύ ὅτι καλὰ καὶ ὠφέλιμα, ἡ αὔξησις ἔσται τὰ γὰρ πράγματα δετ πιστεύεσθαι ὀλιγάκις γὰρ καὶ τούτων ἀποδείξεις φέρουσιν ἐὰν, ἄπιστα ἢ ἢ ἐὰν ἄλλος αἰταίν ἔχῃ.

[52]Quintilian (VII iv 3): item demonstrativae partis omnia sunt in hoc statu: factum esse constat, quale sit facctum quaeritur.

[53]Aristotle, Rhetoric (1358b 38): ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ οἱ ἐπαινοῦντες καὶ οἱ ψέγοντες οὐ σκοποῦσιν εἰ συμφέροντα ἔπραξεν ἢ βλαβερά, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ἐπαίνῳ πολλάκις τιθέασιν ὅτι ὀλιγωρήσας τοῦ αὐτῷ λυσιτελοῦντος ἔπραξεν ὅτι καλόν.

[54]Aristotle, Rhetoric (1356a 1): τῶν δὲ διὰ τοῦ λόγου ποριζομένων πίστεων τρία εἴδη ἐστίν αἱ μὲν γάρ εἰσιν ἐν τῷ ἤθει τοῦ λέγοντος, αἱ δὲ ἐν τῷ τὸν ἀκροατὴν διαθεῖναί πως, αἱ δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ λόγῳ διὰ τοῦ δεικνύναι ἢ φαίνεσθαι δεικνύναι.

[55]Aristotle, Rhetoric (1366a 25).

[56]Aristotle, Rhetoric (1358b 27): τοῖς δὲ ἐπαινοῦσι καὶ ψέγουσι τὸ καλὸν καὶ τὸ αἰσχρόν, τὰ δ' ἄλλα καὶ οὗτοι πρὸς ταῦτα ἐπαναφέρουσιν.

[57]Quintilian (III vii 6): sed proprium laudis est res amplificare et ornare.

[58]Quintilian (III vii 5): ut desiderat autem laus quae negotiis adhibetur, probationem, sic etiam illa, quae ostentationi componitur.

of what the subject has done, describing its good results, and saying what it is like.[59]

In order to effectively persuade, both Quintilian and Aristotle propose that much depends on the place and subject of the panegyric, on the character of the audience, and on generally received opinion;[60] in fact, a judge is most favorable to the orator whose views he thinks are identical to his own.[61]

The question of time in epideictic speech is related to its purpose. The ceremonial oration is properly speaking, concerned with the present only, because all men praise or blame in view of the state of things currently existing. Although the ceremonial orator sometimes finds it useful to recall the past and to make guesses at the future, the time of the future is more properly the concern of the political, or deliberative orator, and the time of the past is properly the concern of the forensic, or judicial orator.[62]

The aim of the eulogistic speech is praise, and the object of this speech is to show virtue and nobility in the subject.[63] The noble is that which is desirable for its own sake and also worthy of praise; or that which is both good and also pleasant because it is good.[64] Virtue is the faculty of providing and preserving good things (eg. justice, courage, magnificence, magnanimity, temperence, liberality, gentleness, prudence, wisdom); the opposites of these are vices.[65] Consequently, things which are productive of virtue are considered noble, and signs of the presence of virtue are the

---

59Aristotle, Rhetoric (1418a 32): ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐπιδεικτικοῖς δεῖ τὸν λόγον ἐπεισοδιοῦν ἐπαίνοις.

60Quintilian (III vii 23): nam plurimum refert, qui sint audientium mores, quae publice recepta persuasio, ut illa maxime quae probant esse in eo, qui laudabitur, credant, aut in eo contra quem dicemus, ea quae oderunt.

61Quintilian (III vii 25): maxime favet iudex qui sibi dicentem assentari putat.

62Aristotle, Rhetoric (1358b 18): τῷ δ' ἐπιδεικτικοῷ κυριώτατος μὲν ὁ παρών κατὰ γὰρ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἐπαινοῦσιν ἢ ψέγουσι πάντες, προσχρῶνται δὲ πολλάκις καὶ τὰ γενόμενα ἀναμιμνήσκοντες καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα προεικάζοντες.

63Aristotle, Rhetoric (1366a 23): μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα λέγωμεν περὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας καὶ καλοῦ καὶ αἰσχροῦ οὗτοι γὰρ σκοποὶ τῷ ἐπαινοῦντι καὶ ψέγοντι.

64Aristotle, Rhetoric (1366a 33): καλοῦ μὲν οὖν ἐστιν ὃ ἂν δι' αὑτὸ αἱρετὸν ὂν ἐπαινετὸν ᾖ, ἢ ὃ ἂν ἀγαθὸν ὂν ἡδὺ ᾖ ὅτι ἀγαθόν εἰ δὴ τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ καλόν, ἀνάγκη τὴν ἀρετὴν καλὸν εἶναι.

65Aristotle, Rhetoric (1366a 36): ἀρετὴ δ' ἐστὶ μὲν δύναμις, ὡς δοκεῖ, ποριστικὴ ἀγαθῶν καὶ φυλακτική, καὶ δύναμις εὐεργετικὴ πολλῶν καὶ μελάγων καὶ πάντων περὶ πάντα.

acts to which it leads. According to Aristotle, noble actions are those which are done for honor, rather than for reward, so are also those in which a man aims at something desirable for someone else's sake, as individual interests are selfish.[66] Likewise, noble things are those whose advantage may be enjoyed after death, rather than in one's lifetime: the latter tend to be selfish, while the former are not done for one's own benefit.[67] Aristotle describes praise as the expression in words of the eminence of a man's good qualities, and therefore the orator must display the subject's actions as the product of such qualities; when eulogizing, the orator must show that praiseworthy things belong to the person in question or to his actions.[68] Cicero adds that praise and censure are derived from the topics that are employed with respect to the attributes of persons: mind (virtues), body (health, strength), and external circumstances (public office, marriage).[69] According to Cicero, the ceremonial orator should not praise attributes or external circumstances, but rather the subject's *gestae* or *actiones humanas* (i.e. what he makes of these circumstances).[70] Quintilian adds that demonstrative oratory consists of praise and denunciation, and that the orator must consider not only the acts actually performed by the person of whom he speaks, but also what honors were given after death.[71]

The structure of a ceremonial oration has unique features in the *introductio* , the *narratio* , and the argumentation within the *narratio* .

---

[66]Aristotle, Rhetoric (1366b 25): φανερὸν γὰρ ὅτι ἀνάγκη τά τε ποιητικὰ τῆς ἀρετῆς εἶναι καλά (πρὸς ἀρετὴν γάρ) καὶ τὰ ἀπ' ἀρετῆς γιγνόμενα, τοιαῦτα δὲ τά τε σημεῖα τῆς ἀρετῆς καὶ τὰ ἔργα.

[67]Aristotle, Rhetoric (1366b 36): καὶ τὰ ἁπλῶς ἀγαθά ὅσα ὑπέρ τε πατρίδος τις ἐποίησε, παριδὼν τὸ αὑτοῦ καὶ τὰ τῇ φύσει ἀγαθά καὶ ἃ μὴ αὐτοῷ ἀγαθά αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἕνεκα τὰ τοιαῦτα καὶ ὅσα τεθνεῶτι ἐνδέχεται ὑπάρχειν μᾶλλον ἢ ζῶντι τὸ γὰρ αὐτοῦ ἕνεκα μᾶλλον ἔχει τὰ ζῶντι.

[68]Aristotle, Rhetoric to Alexander (1425b 40): ἐπαινετα μὲν οὖν ἐστι πράγματα τά δικάια καὶ τά νομιμά καὶ τά συμφεροντα καὶ τά καλά καὶ τά ηδεά καὶ τά ραδιά πραχθῆναι.

[69]Cicero, De inventione (II lix 177): laudes autem et vituperationes ex eis locis sumentur qui loci personis sunt attributi.

[70]Cicero, De inventione (II lix 178): videre autem in laudando et in vituperando oportebit non tam, quae in corpore aut in extraneis rebus habuerit is de quo agetur, quam quo pacto his rebus asus sit.

[71]Quintilian (VIII pr. 8): his adiciciebamus demonstrativam laude ac vituperatione constare.

Aristotle compares the *introductio* to a musical prelude;[72] just as a flute-player first plays some brilliant passage he knows well and then fits it on to the opening notes of the piece itself, so in speeches of display the writer begins with what best takes his fancy, and then strikes up his theme, and then leads into it.[73] Quintilian states that the introduction in a demonstrative speech may be treated with the utmost artistic freedom.[74] Aristotle gives several choices for the subject of the *introductio* ; the orator frequently begins with some piece of praise or censure,[75] or he may begin with a piece of advice,[76] or he may begin with appeals to the audience to excuse him if the speech is flawed;[77] the orator has the choice of making these preliminary passages connected or disconnected with the speech itself. Cicero likewise gives several choices for the subject of the *introductio* : it may be drawn from the speaker's own person (*aut ab nostra*), or from the person being discussed (*aut ab eius de quo loquemur),* or from the person of the audience (*aut ab eorum qui audient persona*), or from the subject matter itself (*aut ab re*).[78] When the introduction is drawn from the speaker's person, the orator says that he speaks words of praise from a sense of duty, or because of friendship, or from goodwill, or because it is appropriate to show the praise accorded to the subject.[79] When the introduction is drawn from the person being discussed, the orator says that he is unable to match the subject's great deeds with words (i.e. all persons ought to proclaim the subject's virtues; his very deeds transcend the

---

[72]Aristotle, Rhetoric (1414b 21): τὸ μὲν οὖν προαύλιον ὅμοιον τῷ τῶν ἐπιδεικτικῶν προοιμίῳ.

[73]Aristotle, Rhetoric (1414b 24): καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐπιδεικτικοῖς λόγοις δεῖ οὕτω γράφειν ὅ τι γὰρ ἂν βούληται εὐθὺ εἰπόντα ἐνδοῦναι καὶ συναψαι.

[74]Quintilian (III viii 9): in demonstrativis vero prohoemia esse maxime libera existimat.

[75]Aristotle, Rhetoric (1414b 30): λέγεται δὲ τὰ τῶν ἐπιδεικτικῶν προοίμια ἐξ ἐπαίνου ἢ ψόγου.

[76]Aristotle, Rhetoric (1414b 35): οἷον ὅτι δεῖ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς.

[77]Aristotle, Rhetoric (1415a 1): ἔτι δ' ἐκ τῶν δικανικῶν προοιμίων τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶν ἐκ τῶν πρὸς τὸν ἀκροατήν εἰ περὶ παραδόξου λόγος ἢ περὶ χαλεποῦ ἢ περὶ τεθρυλημένου πολλοῖς, ὥστε συγγνώμην ἔχειν.

[78]Rhetorica ad Herennium (III vi 11-12).

[79]Rhetorica ad Herennium (III vi 11): ab nostra, si laudabimus: aut officio facere, quod causa necessitudinis intercedat; aut studio, quod eiusmodi virtute sit ut omnes commemorare debeant velle; aut quod rectum sit ex aliorum laude ostendere qualis ipsius animus sit.

eloquence of all eulogists).[80] When the introduction is drawn from the audience, the orator either refreshes their memories of who the subject is, or introduces him, if they are not already acquainted with him (the orator must make his audience desire to know an individual of such excellence).[81] Finally, when the introduction is drawn from the subject matter itself, the orator says that there are many good things to be said, that by beginning to speak he fears that he may not be able to do justice to the subject matter.[82]

Regarding *narratio* , Aristotle states that narration in ceremonial oratory is not continuous but intermittent.[83] Speech is a composition consisting of two parts: the actions themselves (of which the author has no artistic input), and the proof that the actions were done, the description of their quality, or of their extent, or all three (over which the orator does have artistic control).[84] Cicero points out that when describing the life of an individual, proper sequence and chronology must be followed.[85] The orator begins by setting forth the virtues of the subject, and then explains how, being such his character, the subject used the advantages or disadvantages of physical or external circumstances. According to Cicero, the proper order for the portrayal of a life is to first describe external circumstances (parentage, education), then physical advantages (beauty, strength), and then to return to external circumstances and comment on the

---

80Rhetorica ad Herennium (III vi 11): ab eius persona de quo loquemur, si laudabimus vereri nos ut illius facta verbis consequi possimus; omnes homines illius virtutes praedicare oportere; ipsa facta omnium laudatorum eloquentiam anteire).

81Rhetorica ad Herennium (III vi 12): ab auditorum persona: si laudabimus, quonium non apud ignotos laudemus, nos monendi causa pauca dicturos, aut si erunt ignoti, ut talem virum velint cognoscere petemus.

82Rhetorica ad Herennium (III vi 12): ab rebus ipsis: incertos esse quid potissimum laudemus vereri ne, cum multa dixerimus, plura praetereamus.

83Aristotle, Rhetoric (1416b 16): διήγησις δ' ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἐπιδεικτικοῖς ἐστιν οὐκ ἐφεξῆς ἀλλὰ κατὰ μέρος.

84Aristotle, Rhetoric (1416b 17): δεῖ μὲν γὰρ τὰς πράξεις διελθεῖν ἐξ ὧν ὁ λόγος, δύγκειται γὰρ ἔχων ὁ λόγος τὸ μὲν ἄτεχνον (οὐδὲν γὰρ αἴτιος ὁ λέγων τῶν πράξεων) τὸ δ' ἐκ τῆς τέχνης τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶν ἢ ὅτι ἔστι δεῖξαι, ἐὰν ᾖ ἄπιστον, ἢ ὅτι ποιόν, ἢ ὅτι ποσόν, ἢ καὶ ἅπαντα.

85Rhetorica ad Herennium (III vii 13): deinde ut quaeque quove tempore res erit gesta ordine dicemus, ut quid quamque tute cauteque egerit intellegatur.

subject's virtue in respect to these.[86] Cicero adds that the *narratio* must be followed by a concluding section, in the form of a summary.[87]

Epideictic oratory is also characterized by freedom of rhythm. Quintilian states that demonstrative oratory requires freer and more expansive rhythms, while forensic and deliberative oratory vary the arrangement of their words in conformity with the variety of their themes.[88]

Epideictic speech is also distinguished from deliberative and forensic by its great degree of ornamentation. Aristotle explains that ceremonial oration is the most highly finished of all three kinds of oration: epideictic speech is the most literate, it is meant to be read.[89] Quintilian explains why epideictic speech is best suited for writing: deliberative oratory is entirely concerned with outer display, and forensic oratory requires only truth and prudence; demonstrative oratory, on the other hand, requires art, because the speaker must in effect, deceive his audience.[90] According to Quintilian, the ceremonial orator is permitted to be more ornate and to flaunt the resources of his art before those who have been summoned to hear him.[91] The oratory of display aims solely at delighting the audience and therefore develops all the resources of eloquence and deploys all its ornament, since it seeks not to steal its way into the mind of its audience,

---

[86] Rhetorica ad Herennium (III vii 14): ordinem hunc adhibere in demonstranda vita dememus ab externis rebus, ad corporis commoda, ad extraneas res.

[87] Rhetorica ad Herennium (III viii 15): conclusionibus brevibus utemur, enumeratione ad exitum causae.

[88] Quintilian, Institutio oratoria (IX iv 130): demonstrativum genus omne fusiores habet liberioresque numeros; iudicale et contionale, ut materia varium est, sic etiam ipsa conlocatione verborum.

[89] Aristotle, Rhetoric (1414a 17): ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐπιδεικτικὴ λέξις γραφικωτάτη· τὸ γὰρ ἔργον αὐτῆς ἀνάγνωσις, δευτέρα δὲ ἡ δικανική.

[90] Quintilian (III viii 63): namque Aristoteles idoneam maxime ad scribendum demonstrativam proximamque ab ea iudicialem putavit, videlicet quoniam prior illa tota esset ostentationis, haec secunda egeret artis vel ad fallendum, si ita poposcisset utilitas consilia fide prudentiaque constarent.

[91] Quintilian (II x 11): nam et iis actionibus, quae in aliqua sine dubio veritate versantur sed sunt ad popularem aptatae delectationem, quales legimus panegyricos, totumque hoc demonstativium genus, permittitur adhibere plus cultus omnemque artem, quae latere plerumque in iudiciis debet non confiteri modo sed ostentare etiam hominibus in hoc advocatis.

nor to triumph over its opponent, but aims solely at honor and glory.[92] Thus, much more elegance and ornament is allowed by the topics of demonstrative oratory, whose main object is the delectation of the audience.[93]

The final, and most distinctive feature of epideictic speech is the use of amplification. Aristotle suggests a number of ways for heightening the effect in a panegyric speech: the orator may point out that a man is the first, the only, or almost the only one who has done something, or make much of a particular season and occasion of an action, arguing that the man went beyond what was expected of him, or point out that a man frequently succeeded (i.e. it was his own doing, not just luck), or compare him to famous men.[94] Other methods for amplification are also available: the orator may show that the actions of the person have produced good or bad results,[95] or he may compare his judgement against another's (making his case look stronger),[96] or he may compare his case with the smallest of things which fall into the same class (making his appear greater),[97] or he may mention opposites (thus amplifying his good qualities).[98] According

---

92Quintilian (VIII iii 11): namque illud genus ostentationi compositum solam petit audientium voluptatem, ideoque omnes dicendi artes aperit ornatumque orationis exponit, ut quod non insidietur nec ad victoriam sed ad solum finem laudis et gloriae tendat.

93Quintilian (XI i 48): illud iam diximus, quanto plus nitoris et cultus demonstativae materiae, ut ad delectationem audientium compositae.

94Aristotle, Rhetoric (1368a 10): χρηστέον δὲ καὶ τῶν αὐξητιῶν πολλοῖς οἷον, εἰ μόνος ἢ πρῶτος ἢ μετ' ὀλίγων ἢ καὶ ὃ μάλιστα πεποίηκεν; ἅπαντα γὰρ ταῦτα καλά. καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν ταῦτα δὲ εἰ παρὰ τὸ προσῆκον. καὶ εἰ πολλάκις τὸ αὐτὸ κατώρθωκεν μέγα γάρ, καὶ οὐκ ἀποτύχης ἀλλὰ δι' αὑτὸν ἂν δόξειεν καὶ εἰ τὰ προτρέποντα καὶ τιμῶντα διὰ τοῦτον εἴρηται καὶ κατεσκευάσθην.

95Aristotle, Rhetoric to Alexander (1426a 20): τὰ τοιαῦτα τόνδε τον τροπόν μετιῶν, πρωτόν μὲν ἀπρόφαινῶν, ὥσπερ ἀρτιῶς μετηλθόν, υπο τοὐτουι πολλὰ γεγενησθαι ἢ κακά ἢ ἀγαθά.

96Aristotle, Rhetoric to Alexander (1426a 23): δεύτερος δὲ κεκριμενόν μέταφερεὶν, ἂν μὲν ἐπαινῃς, ἀγαθόν, ἀν δὲ ψεγῃς, κακόν, ἐιτα παρισταναί τὸ ὑπο σὸυ λεγεμενόν, καὶ παραβελλείν πρὸς ἀλλὴλα, τούμὲν ὑπο σαυτόυ λεγομενόυ τὰ μέγιστα διεξιῶν τούδ ἐτερου τὸ ἐλαχίστα, καὶ ὀυτῶ μέγα φανηναὶ.

97Aristotle, Rhetoric to Alexander (1426a 28): τρίτος δὲ προς τὸ υπο σαύτου λεγομενόν ἀντιπαραβαλλεῖν τουλαχιστόν τῶν ὑπο τῆν αυτὴν ιδεάν πιπτοντῶν φανειταὶ γάρ ὀυτῶ τὸ ὑπὸ σὸυ λεγομενόν μειζόν, ὥσπερ οἱ μετρίοι τὰ μεγεθῆ φαίνονταὶ μέιζοῦς ὁταν πρός βραχυτεροῦς παρὰστωσῖν.

98Aristotle, Rhetoric to Alexander (1426a 32): ἐσται δὲ καὶ ωδε παντῶς αυξειν ἐι κεκριταὶ μὲγα ἀγαθόν τουτὸ τουτῶ τὶ ἐναντιόν ἐαν λέγῃς, μὲγα κακόν φανειταί ωσαυτῶς δὲ ἐι νομιζεταὶ μὲγα κακόν, ἐαν τὸ τοῦτω ἐναντιόν λέγῃς, μὲγα ἀγαθόν φανειταί.

to Aristotle, it is only appropriate that methods of heightening the effect should be attached particularly to speeches of praise, as they aim at proving superiority over others, and such superiority is a form of nobility.[99] In epideictic speech, the subject's actions are taken as facts; the task of the orator is to invest these with dignity and nobility.

The ceremonial discourse of classical times allowed the orator great artistic freedom. While remaining faithful to the five-fold principles of rhetorical theory, ceremonial orators used the epideictic discourse to display masterful use of ornamental devices and to play upon the emotions of their listeners. It was upon the classical tradition of epideictic speech, that Christian orators developed a theory of homiletics. Christian sermon writers borrowed heavily from classical theory, and one of the most important Ukrainian preachers to do so, was Ioannykij Galjatovs'kyj.

---

[99] Aristotle, Rhetoric (1368a 22): πίπτει δ' εὐλόγως ἡ αὔξησις εἰς τοὺς ἐπαίνους ἐν ὑπεροχῇ γάρ ἐστιν, ἡ δ' ὑπεροχὴ τῶν καλῶν.

Chapter Two: Kliuč razuměnija

Ioannykij Galjatovs'kyj's homiletical tract, "Nauka, albo sposob złożenja kazanja", included in his collection of sermons, Kliuč razuměnija, outlines the essential features of the Ukrainian Baroque sermon. Galjatovs'kyj's homiletical theory greatly influenced the art of sermon writing in Ukraine during this period; consequently a familiarity with Galjatovs'kyj's "Nauka" is a prerequisite for the analysis of sacred orations produced in Ukraine during the latter half of the seventeenth century.

The life of Ioannykij Galjatovs'kyj (1620?-1688) coincided with the widespread acceptance of humanistic approach to Latin learning throughout Ukraine. The study of Latin enabled Ukrainian scholars to make use of previously inaccessible Latin and Western European texts.[100] The discovery of Latin learning ("latins'koje učenije") and the spread of Western European culture resulted in a flowering of Ukrainian culture during this period. Latin and neo-Latin influences were left in many fields, including literature.[101] The Ukrainian school approach to sermon writing, in particular, was characterized by the use of classical Greek and Roman rhetorical manuals in the redaction of the humanist school. Consequently, they accepted the introduction of secular material into homiletical works. K. Xarlampovič identifies Kyrylo Stavrovec'kyj and Meletii Smotryc'kyj as among the first Ukrainian preachers to write typically "scholastic" sermons based on Latin models.[102] Latin scholasticism was first introduced to Ukraine and Lithuania in the schools of the Orthodox Confraternities, the most important of which were located in L'viv (founded in 1586), Vilnius (1585), and Kiev (1615).[103] In 1632,

---

[100]On the use of Latin texts by Ukrainian writers during this period, see Šljapkin 52-111.

[101]Concerning the Latin school tradition and its influence on seventeenth century Ukrainian literature, see: Nikolaj Petrov, "Iz istorii Gomiletiki v staroj Kievskoj Duxovnoj Akademii." Trudy Kievskoj Duxovnoj Akademii 1 (1866): 90; Nikolaj Petrov, Očerki z istorii ukrainskoj literatury XVII i XVIII v. (Kiev: 1911) 20-29; Evgenij Pětuxov, Russkaja literatura (Jur'ev, 1912) 232-240; Ilija Šljapkin, Svjatitel Dimitrij Rostovskij i ego vremja (Sanktpeterburg [St. Petersburg], 1891) 52-68; Nikolaj Sumcov, O literaturnyx nravax južnorusskix pisatelei XVIII v. (Sanktpeterburg [St. Petersburg], 1906) 18.

[102]Konstantin Xarlampovič, Zapadnorusskija pravoslavnyja školy XVI i načala XVII věka (Kazan, 1898) 436.

[103]Xarlampovič 436.

the school of the Kiev Epiphany Confraternity (Bohojavlens'ke Bratstvo) was merged with the school of the Kiev Caves' Monastery (Kyjevo-Pečers'ka Lavra), under the direction of Metropolitan Petro Mohyla, eventually becoming known as the Kiev-Mohyla Collegium.[104] The Kiev Collegium became an important center of learning not only in Ukraine, but in all of Eastern Europe.

The program of study at the Collegium consisted of the humanistic trivium and quadrivium, the crown discipline being theology.[105] Grammatical subjects taught included the study of *analogia* (basic reading and writing), grammar, and syntax. After mastering the these subjects, the students were then introduced to rhetoric and poetics; philosophy and theology were the final subjects covered by the program. Three languages were taught at the school: Latin, Church Slavonic, and Greek, and among other subjects taught were choral music (for liturgical purposes), arithmetic, homiletics (included within the subject of rhetoric), Orthodox catechism, and rudimentary classes in geometry, astronomy, and instrumental music.[106]

The course in rhetoric at the Kiev Collegium was primarily based on the selective study of ancient authors, including Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian. Aside from classical texts in their humanistic, Renaissance redaction, the works of more contemporary European authors were also used, including Augustine's De Doctrina Christiana, the works of Erasmus of Rotterdam, and Nicolai Caussini's Viridarium utisque eruditionis tam sacrae et humanae parallela.[107] A Latin handbook on rhetoric, based on Cicero, titled Orator Mohileanus Marci Tullii Ciceronis apparatissimis partitionibus excultus (1635-36), was complied by Josyf Kononovyč-Horbac'kyj, who taught rhetoric at the Zamość Academy prior to serving as the first instructor of rhetoric at the Kiev Collegium between 1639-

---

[104]Zoja Xyžnjak, Kyjevo-Mohyljans'ka akademija (Kyiv [Kiev]: Vyšča Škola, 1981) 43.
[105]Makarij Bulgakov, Istorija kievskoj akademii (Sanktpeterburg [St. Petersburg], 1843) 53.
[106]Bulgakov 53.
[107]Petrov, "Iz istorii Gomiletiki" 90. For a complete list of Latin rhetorical resources used at the Kiev Collegium prior to 1699, see: Jaroslava Stratij, Vladimir Litvinov, Viktor Andrushko, Opisanie kursov filosofii i ritoriki professorov Kievo-Mogiljanskoj Akademii (Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1982) 11-29.

1642.[108] Orator Mohileanus, following the humanist textbook practise, presented Cicero's De inventione in a more simplified manner.

In addition to Classical and Western European sources of rhetoric, Polish texts were well-known and circulated among Kievan scholars, including the works of Jan Kochanowski,[109] Piotr Skarga,[110] Tomasz Mlodzianowski, Jan Kwiatkiewicz, and Aleksander Lorencowicz.[111] L. Maceevič identifies the works of Skarga and Mlodzianowski as being particularly influential in the study of rhetoric in Kiev.[112] A number of Kievan writers themselves composed sermons in Polish, among them Kasijan Sakovyč, Syl'vestr Kosiv, and Lazar Baranovyč.[113]

Church Slavonic sermons constituted another important source of rhetoric in Kiev. Students at the Collegium were familiar with the works of such well-known sermon writers as Innokentij Gizel', Lazar Baranovyč, Meletij Smotryc'kyj, and Kyrylo Trankvilion Stavrovec'kyj.[114] N. Petrov identifies Gizel' as being the most influential sermon writer in Kiev prior to Galjatovs'kyj.[115] Gizel' taught rhetoric and homiletics at the Collegium during Galjatovs'kyj's student years, and preached at the Caves' Monastery until his death in 1683; he was doubtlessly a great influence on Galjatovs'kyj, and on Galjatovs'kyj's own student, the young Danylo (Dymytrij) Tuptalo.[116]

Ioannykij Galjatovs'kyj studied at the Kiev Collegium, completing the program in the year 1649.[117] While a student at the Collegium, Galjatovs'kyj received instruction in rhetoric from Lazar Baranovyč and

---

[108]Stratij 11.

[109]Čyževs'kyj, A History of Ukrainian Literature 239.

[110]Petrov, "Očerki z istorii" 20.

[111]Tadeusz Grabowski, Historja literatury Polskiej, vol. 1 (Poznań: Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk, 1936) 245.

[112]L. Maceevič, "Pol'skij propovědnik XVII věka Iezuit Foma Mlodzjanovskij." Trudy Kievskoj Duxovnoj Akademii 2 (1870): 109.

[113]Grabowski 249.

[114]Čyževs'kyj, A History of Ukrainian Literature 335.

[115]Petrov, "Očerki z istorii" 20.

[116]Tuptalo knew Gizel' personally, and one of his surviving Ukrainian sermons is an oration on the second anniversary of Gizel's death, "Piramis albo stolp vo blažennoj pamjati prestavlšagosja vysocě v Bogu prevelebnago, ego milosti gospodina otca Innokentija Gizelja."

[117]Xyžnjak 64.

Innokentij Gizel'. Among his fellow students at the Collegium were Antonij Radyvylovs'kyj, Epifanij Slavynec'kyj, Arsenij Satanovs'kyj, and Symeon Poloc'kyj.[118] In 1650, at the invitation of the Lazar Baranovyč, who was that same year appointed rector of the Collegium, Galjatovs'kyj became an instructor in rhetoric.[119] In 1657, Baranovyč was appointed Archbishop of Černihiv, and Galjatovs'kyj assumed the rectorship of the Kiev Collegium.[120] Galjatovs'kyj served as rector from 1657 to 1669, the year in which the school was closed by Hetman Petro Dorošenko.[121] It was during this period that he wrote Kliuč razuměnija.

Kliuč razuměnija was first printed in Kiev in 1659. This first printing included a collection of sermons as well as a homiletical tract, entitled, "Nauka, albo sposob złoženja kazanja". In 1660, a supplement to the first edition was printed, also in Kiev, containing more sermons and further instruction on the composing of sermons, entitled, "Nauka korotkaja, albo sposob złoženja kazanja". Due to the immense popularity of the book, a second and third printing followed soon after, in 1663 and 1665, in L'viv. The L'viv editions of the book were slightly different from the Kiev original, containing numerous additions and revisions.[122]

Galjatovs'kyj's "Nauka" was the first homiletical textbook to be published in Slavic, and it became one of the standard handbooks for sermon writers not only in Ukraine, but throughout the East Slavic world.[123] Among the writers who made extensive use of this text was

---

[118]Konstantyn Bida, Ioanikij Galjatovs'kyj i joho Kliuč razuměnija (Roma [Rome]: Ukrainian Catholic UP, 1975) v.

[119]Nikolaj Sumcov, "Ioannikij Galjatovskij." Kievskaja Starina 6 (1884): 17.

[120]Sumcov, "Ioannikij Galjatovskij" 17.

[121]Bida vii.

[122]For information on the publication of Kliuč razuměnija, see: Michael Berndt, Die Predigt Dimitrij Tuptalos (Frankfurt: Peter Long, 1975) 16; Bida xi; Metropolitan Ilarion (Ohienko), Ukrains'ka Cerkva za čas ruiny, (Winnipeg: Ukrains'ke Naukove Pravoslavne Bohoslovs'ke Tovarystvo, 1956), p. 312; Nikolaj Petrov, "Iz istorii Gomiletiki" 92; Pětuxov 248; Xyžnjak 64.

[123]The importance of Galjatovs'kj's "Nauka" as a homiletical handbook is noted by many scholars, including: Berndt 16; Bida xi; Aleksej Galaxov, Istorija russkoj sovesnosti drevnej i novoj, vol. 1 (Sanktpeterburg [St. Petersburg], 1880) 359; Johannes Langsch, "Zur Charakteristik Simeon Polockijs als Prediger." Kyrios 5 (1940/41): 92; Metropolitan Ilarion, Ukrains'ka Cerkva 312; Petrov "Iz istorii Gomiletiki" 92; Pětuxov 248; Vasilij Sipovskij, Istorija russkoj slovesnosti, vol. 1 (Sankpeterburg [St. Petersburg], 1911) 189; Sumcov "Ioannikij Galjatovskij" 199; Xyžnjak 64.

Dymytrij Tuptalo.[124] Tuptalo's nineteenth century biographer, Ilija Šljapkin, makes numerous references to Galjatovs'kyj's Kliuč razuměnija, the "Nauka, albo sposob zloženja kazanja" and its influence on Tuptalo's sermons.[125] Although Kliuč razuměnija is missing from the list of books found in Tuptalo's library following his death,[126] Šljapkin notes one of Tuptalo's personal letters, in which he refers to Kliuč razuměnija as being indispensible to his work.[127]

The "Nauka, albo sposob zloženja kazanja" found in Kliuč razuměnija[128] consists of 19 folios and contains five lessons on the composing of sermons. Galjatovs'kyj's theory of rhetoric. It is an example of formulatory rhetoric, which is essentially a simplification of classical rhetorical formulae. Galjatovs'kyj's "Nauka" served as a practical guide to sermon writing, and was not intended to replace the study of traditional sources of rhetoric. It was understood as a simplification of classical theory, which was an approach typical of the pedagogy of the humanist school. The "Nauka" closely follows the traditional division of rhetoric into *inventio* , *dispositio* , and *elocutio* , as well as various qualities of epideictic speech such as aim, method of persuasion, object of speech, structure, and ornamentation. N. Petrov identifies Nicolai Caussini's De Eloquentia Sacra et humana as the model upon which Galjatovs'kyj based his "Nauka".[129]

Galjatovs'kyj's treatise, in typical humanistic fashion, fuses Classical theory and models with Christian principles, thus serving the practical

---

[124]Berndt 17.

[125]Šljapkin 45, 124, 125, 128, 131, 132, 290, 336, 430, 431, 448.

[126]Šljapkin 54-58.

[127]Šljapkin 430: Ключъ разумѣнія въ Ярославли же снискалъ, но непольныи ибо два суть выхода Ключовъ тѣхъ: первый Печерской печати, тои непольныи, а другій Львовскои печати полныи болье Печерскаго. Аще бы лучилось чесности твоей у кого обрѣсти Ключъ Львовскаго выхода, молю на малое время мнѣ прислать: нуждица мнѣ въ немъ нѣчто прійскать.

[128]In this thesis all references to Kliuč razuměnija and to the "Nauka, albo sposob zloženja kazanja" refer to the 1665 L'viv edition, as given in Galjatovs'kyj, Kliuč razuměnija, I. Čepiha, ed. (Kyiv [Kiev]: Naukova Dumka, 1985). Quotations from the text are given according to folio number.

[129]Petrov, "Iz istorii Gomiletiki" 92.

needs of sermon writers in seventeenth century Ukraine. M. Speranskij divides Ukrainian sermons of this period into two types.[130] The first type is the systematic theological tract, representing a traditional, polemical approach to the sacred oration. These kinds of sermons were usually written for a select audience, and the usual topic of these orations was a denunciation of the Uniate movement and a defense of Orthodoxy. Among the orators who represent this first group are Zaxarij Kopystens'kij and Meletij Smotryc'kyj. The second type of sermon, according to Speranskij, is the popular sermon, incorporating Western elements of style and being directed for mass consumption. Speranskij places Ioannykij Galjatovs'kyj in this second category. M. Markovskij identifies Galjatovs'kyj with a new generation of sermon writers, along with Antonij Radyvylovs'kyj, who incorporated two essential elements into their work: Latin school learning, and Ukrainian "vernacularism".[131] The results were well-structured sermons intended for popular consumption.

Galjatovs'kyj' begins his "Nauka" with a discussion of *inventio* . His sources for *inventio* reflect the Christian context of the Ukrainian Baroque Sermon. Above all else, Galjatovs'kyj emphasizes that the primary source of material for writing a sermon is the Bible, followed by the Lives of the Saints, the writings of the Church Fathers (including St. Basil the Great, St. Gregory the Theologian, St. John Chrysostom, St. Athanasius Theodorite, St. John of Damascus, St. Ephraim the Syrian), and lastly other sources, including books of history and natural science.[132]

---

[130]Mixail Speranskij, Istorija drevnei russkoj literatury, vol. 2 (Moskva [Moscow]: Sabašnikov, 1921) 235-236.

[131]M. Markovskij, Antonij Radivilovskij, Južno-russkij propovědnik XVII v., (Kiev, 1884) 49.

[132]Galjatovs'kyj (519): треба читати Библію, животы святыхъ, треба читати учителей церковныхъ - Василія Великаго, Григорія Богослова, Іωанна Златоустаго, Аѳанасія Ѳеωдорита, Іωанна Дамаскина, Єфрема и иншихъ учителей церковныхъ, котрыи писмо святоє въ библіи толкуютъ, треба читати гисторіи и кройники ω розманитыхъ панствахъ и сторонахъ, що ся въ нихъ дѣяло и теперъ що ся дѣетъ, треба читати книги ω звѣрох, птахахъ, гадахъ, рыбахъ, деревахъ, зѣлахъ, камѣняхъ и розманитыхъ водахъ, которыи въ морю, въ рѣкахъ, въ студняхъ и на иншихъ мѣстцахъ знайдуются, и

The inclusion of non-biblical sources for the writing of Church sermons is typical of the humanistic approach to sermon writing during the Baroque. Several scholars see Galjatovs'kyj's "Nauka" as the text which firmly entrenches scholastic thought into Ukrainian sermon writing, where it was to remain until the decline of this form of literature in the eighteenth century.[133] Galjatovs'kyj himself remarks that the use of non-religious background material for sermons may be seen in the homiletical works of his contemporaries (i.e. use of such material is rarely encountered in Patristic sermons).[134] Despite this allowance for the use of secular background material, Galjatovs'kyj makes it clear that Holy Scriptures are to be the primary sources for *inventio*, and all non-sacred material is clearly of secondary importance; this is evident from the order in which he gives these sources.[135] This use of non-sacred material in Galjatovs'kyj's theory of sermon writing does not necessarily suggest, as V. Vomperskij proposes,[136] that a radical, secular approach to rhetoric pushed aside Christian sources for sermon writing in Ukraine. The use of secular material in Galjatovs'kyj's Kliuč razuměnija is typical of the humanistic fusion of the secular with the religious. Galjatovs'kyj himself insists that the choice of background material for a sermon must, above all else, be appropriate "for the praise of God, for the rebuke of heretics, for the edification of believers, and for the salvation of souls".[137]

уважати ихъ натуру, власности и скутки и тос собѣ нотовати и аппльковати до свос речи, которую повѣдати хочешъ.

[133]Pětuxov 247; Ivan Porfir'ev, Istorija russkoj slovesnosti (Kazan, 1879) 592.

[134]Galjatovs'kyj (519): До тогї читай казаня розмаитыхъ казнодѣївъ теперешънегї вѣку и ихъ наслѣдуй.

[135]Galjatovs'kyj (519): треба читати Бѣблѣю, животы святыхъ, треба читати учителей церковныхъ..., треба читати книги ѡ звѣрох, птахахъ, гадахъ, etc.

Interestingly, Galjatovs'kyj's use of secular material in the sermons found in Kliuč razuměnija is extremely rich. See Ivan Ogienko (Ohienko), "Naučnyja znanija v 'Kliučě razuměnija' Ioannikija Galjatovskago, južno-russkago propovědnika XVII věka." Lětopis Ekaterinoslavskoj Gubernskoj Arxivnoj Komissii 10 (1914): 65-96.

[136]Valentin Vomperskij, Ritoriki v Rossii XVII-XVIII vv. (Moskva [Moscow]: Nauka, 1980) 27.

[137]Galjatovs'kyj (519): Єсли тыи книги и казаня будешъ читати, знайдешъ в нихъ достатечную матерїю, зъ которои можешъ

Galjatovs'kyj's *inventio* only goes so far as to describe the appropriate types of literature to be used as background material for the writing of a sermon. The other aspect of *inventio* , that of the discovery of valid or seemingly valid arguments to render one's cause plausible, is not elaborated upon in his "Nauka". The reason for this most likely lies in the very nature of the subject matter: these sermons are of a theological nature, therefore the validity or non-validity of a certain viewpoint is already predetermined by Sacred Tradition and the teachings of the Church Fathers. Although demonstrative oratory allows for great variety in techniques of argumentation, the viewpoints presented in Sacred Orations must be in accordance with Orthodox Christian belief. A proper selection of background material based on Holy Scriptures automatically gives the preacher a valid argument upon which to build his sermon. Galjatovs'kyj warns his students that the viewpoints presented in a sermon are not the personal viewpoints of the author, but the Universal Truths of the Body of Christ - the Church.[138]

Galjatovs'kyj's theory of *dispositio* is presented at the very beginning of "Nauka". He describes three *partes oratoriae* : *exordium* , *narratio* , and *conclusio*. *Exordium* is the beginning section wherein the preacher introduces his very point, guides and familiarizes his listeners with his propositions, establishes the subject upon which he wishes to preach, shows what he wishes to accomplish in his sermon, asks for Divine guidance, and invites his audience to listen to his speech.[139] *Narratio* is the section in which the preacher guides his listeners along the path of his various arguments, thereby accomplishing what he promised to accomplish

---

зложити казаньє на хвалу Божїю, на ѡтпоръ геретыкѡмъ, на збудованьє вѣрнымъ и на спасенїє души своєи.

[138]Galjatovs'kyj (517): Постерьгай и того пилне, жебы наука въ твоємъ казаню згажалася зъ наукою Христовою, апостолскою, Святыхъ отецъ и всеи Церкви православнои.

[139]Galjatovs'kyj (513): Першая часть е҃ордїумъ, початокъ, въ которомъ казнодья приступъ чынитъ до самои рѣчи, которую маєтъ повѣдати, и ѡзнаймуєтъ людемъ про позыцїю свою, постановленьє умыслу своєгѡ, що постановилъ и умыслилъ на казанью мовити и показати, ѡ чымъ хочетъ казаньє мѣти и проситъ Бога албо пречистую дѣву ѡ помочъ и людей ѡ слуханьє.

in his *exordium*. .[140] The *conclusio* is the final part of the oration,[141] in which the preacher summarizes the main ideas presented in the *narratio*. Galjatovs'kyj's *conclusio* is similar to Cicero's three-part theory of *peroratio* [142], in which the author firstly summarizes the main ideas presented in his speech,[143] secondly arouses sympathy for his own viewpoint,[144] and thirdly arouses ill-will against the opposing point of view.[145]

Galjatovs'kyj's theory of *elocutio* .follows the Ciceronian concept of style based on *docere* , *delectare* , *movere* .[146] In the "Nauka", Galjatovs'kyj adheres to the stylistic middle of *delectare* . On one hand, he stresses the didactic purpose of the sermon, which is to instruct believers.[147] Galjatovs'kyj emphasizes the need for the sermon to be intelligible, because without this quality, the sermon gives rise to confusion, which is tantamount to false preaching.[148] On the other hand, he also emphasizes that a good preacher must delight his audience. It is through imaginative wordplay, association, and other ornamental devices that the orator entices his audience to listen further. Several sections of the "Nauka" are given to techniques for "attracting the audience's attention" ("можешъ повабити людей до слуханья...")[149] through the use of delightful language.

---

[140]Galjatovs'kyj (513): Другая часть наррацїя, повѣсть, бо въ той части повѣдаєть южъ показуєтъ тую речъ, которою ѡбѣцалъ показати.

[141]Galjatovs'kyj (513): Третяя часть єстъ конклюзїя, конецъ казанья.

[142]cf. Cicero, De inventione (I lii 98).

[143]Galjatovs'kyj (513): Въ той части казнодья припоминаєтъ тую речъ, которую повѣдалъ въ наррацыи.

[144]Galjatovs'kyj (513): и напоминаєтъ людей, жебы ѡни въ такой ся речы кохали, єсли будетъ тая речъ добрая.

[145]Galjatovs'kyj (513): Єсли зась злая, напоминаєтъ людей жебы ся такои речы хронили.

[146]cf. Cicero, Orator 6.

[147]Galjatovs'kyj (517): Старайся, жебы всѣ люде зрозумѣли тоє, що ты мовишъ на казаню.

[148]Galjatovs'kyj (517): Єсли будешъ слово Божоє проповѣдати, а нѣкто егѡ не розумѣєтъ, себе самого будешъ проповѣдати и выславляти, не слово Божіє.

[149]Galjatovs'kyj (516).

Pronutiatio and *memoria* are not found in Galjatovs'kyj's "Nauka". These two areas of rhetoric are beyond the scope of Galjatovs'kyj's treatise, which is concerned with the composition of sermons (i.e. "зложеня казаня") rather than their delivery. A number of Soviet scholars have suggested that the study of *pronuntiatio* and *memoria* was generally neglected in Ukrainian schools, much more attention being given to the first three elements of rhetorical theory (i.e. *inventio , dispositio , elocutio*). Both Nina Novikova and V. Vomperskij observe that the two subjects of *pronuntiatio* and *memoria* were frequently treated as one; Vomperskij even suggests that many instructors of rhetoric in Kiev ignored these subjects entirely.[150]

In addition to the general aspects of *inventio , dispositio* , and *elocutio* common to all forms of rhetoric, Galjatovs'kyj's "Nauka" also contains a wealth of material characteristic of epideictic or ceremonial discourse. The aim of sermon writing is self-evident: while Classical orators sought to praise Greek and Roman gods, and to magnify those individuals who served the state, Christian preachers glorify the Holy Trinity, and praise those individuals who offer service to the Church.[151] Therefore, Galjatovs'kyj's "Nauka" is concerned with the eulogistic branch of epideictic speech, in which worthy purposes and actions are amplified.[152] The individuals who are eulogized in this type of oration are Jesus Christ, the Theotokos, the Saints, and other pious individuals. Galjatovs'kyj treats these subjects in three different chapters of his "Nauka": " Simple Instruction on the Composing of Sermons for the Lord's Day",[153] "Simple Instruction on the Composing of Sermons for Feast days of the Lord, and of the Theotokos, and of other Saints",[154] and "Instruction on the Composing of Sermons for Funerals." [155]

---

[150]Nina Novikova, "Poetika i ritorika v Kievo-Mogiljanskoj akademii." Russkaja reč 6 (1987): 94. Vomperskij 30.

[151]Edward Corbett, in Classical Rhetoric (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965) 29, places the art of Christian preaching under the heading of epideictic oratory.

[152]cf. Aristotle, Rhetoric (1425b 36).

[153]"Наука албо способъ латвьйшїй казанья на недель"

[154]"Наука латвьйшая албо способъ зложеня казаня на праздники Господскїи и Богородичныи и на Свята иншыи"

[155]"Наука, албо способъ зложеня казанья на погребъ"

The method of persuasion found in Galjatovs'kyj's theory closely agrees with Aristotle's second mode of persuasion,[156] that of putting the audience into a frame of mind where they take on the speaker's viewpoint. Just as Aristotle advises the ceremonial orator to intersperse the oration with bits of episodic eulogy,[157] speaking of the subject's virtue and describing its good results, so likewise does Galjatovs'kyj advise his students to remind listeners of a particular Saint's virtues, of the good acts by which he or she served Christ, and of the miracles which bear testimony to his or her Holiness.[158] Galjatovs'kyj similarly agrees with Quintilian, that a certain amount of proof is required in panegyric speech;[159] in order to be credible, Galjatovs'kyj advises his students to frequently quote other sources which support the speaker's viewpoint. The suggested sources include Biblical references, the witness of various Saints and Church Fathers, examples, analogies, and, in fact, anything which may lend credibility to the sermon.[160]

Galjatovs'kyj mentions the subject of time only within his discussion of *adjuratio* , or the question of continuity from one sermon to the next. He suggests that a preacher might wish to place his sermon within a chronological sequence by ending a sermon with a preview of the next homily which is to be expected on the following Sunday or feastday. He

---

156cf. Aristotle, Rhetoric (1366a 1).

157cf. Aristotle, Rhetoric (1418a 32).

158Galjatovs'kyj (515): Єсли зась въ Свято схочешъ казаньє повъдати, на томъ казаню хвали того Святого, которого въ той день празднуютъ, наприкладъ, Пречистую Дѣву Богородицу, албо апостола, албо пророка, албѡ мученика, албо Святителя, албѡ пистелника, албѡ иншого Святого, припоминай егѡ цнѡты и добрыи учинки, которыи ѡнъ мѣлъ, живучи на свѣтѣ, якъ служилъ Богу и Церкви Святой, що за Христа теръпѣлъ, якиє чинилъ чуда и теперъ якіи чинитъ людемъ, утькаючимъся до егѡ добродѣйства.

159cf. Quintilian (III vii 5).

160Galjatovs'kyj (517): До того, що мовишъ на казаню, доводи того писмѡмъ Святымъ зъ Библьи, албѡ свѣдоцтвом Святого ѡтца якого, учителя Церковнаго, албѡ прикладомъ, албѡ подобенствомъ, албѡ яким-колвекъ доводом потверди и подопри свою мову, то вѣдячнѣйшая твоя мова будетъ людемъ, которыи тебе слухаютъ, и вѣритимутъ тому, що мовишъ.

gives an example from his own works[161] in which a sermon for Palm Sunday concludes with an invitation to participate in the services for Passion Week; thus, the theme of Christ's Passion is then directed toward the preacher's upcoming sermon for Holy Thursday.

Regarding the aim of eulogistic speech, Galjatovs'kyj affirms that the object of such speech is to show virtue and nobility in the subject. Galjatovs'kyj's definition of virtue, however, reflects the basis of his thought in Christian ethics. Among the virtues that he gives as examples in the 'Nauka" are humility, fasting, generosity, love for one's neighbor, patience, quietness, prayer, obedience, purity, living according to God's commandments, meekness, and righteousness.[162] The opposites of these virtues are the vices: pride, anger, jealousy, sloth, drunkenness, avarice, and other sins.[163] In his instruction on funeral orations ("Наука, албо способъ зложеня казанья на погребъ"), Galjatovs'kyj gives a complete list of good qualities for which the subject of an oration may be praised, including the individual's loyalty to the Orthodox faith and his various *gestae humanas* . He gives numerous examples of such acts, including care and generosity toward the poor, offerings to churches, monasteries, hospitals, the welcoming of visitors, travelers, and pilgrims, the liberation of slaves from captivity, acts of humility and piety, frequent participation in the Sacraments of Confession and Holy Communion, in addition to fasting, prayer, and other selfless works and efforts for the benefit of Church and homeland.[164] Thus the object of the Sacred oration

---

[161]Galjatovs'kyj (518): Належитъ вѣдати и тое, же казнодѣи, скончивши казанье на катедрѣ албо на амбонѣ, звыкли часомъ на пришлую недѣлю албо на пришлое свято на казанье людей запрошати.

[162]Galjatovs'kyj (515): Єсли въ недѣлю схочешъ казанє повѣдати, обѣцуй въ пропозыцыи що доброє хвалити, наприкладъ, покору, постъ, ялмужну, страннолюбіе, терпеніе, молчаніе, молитву, послушенство, чистость девическую, животъ законничый, кротость, справедливость, албо иншую цноту.

[163]Galjatovs'kyj (515): Єсли теж схочешъ, обѣцуй въ пропозыцыи що злоє ганити, наприклад, пыху, гнѣвъ, заздрость, лакомство, пянство, вшетеченство албо иншый грѣхъ.

[164]Galjatovs'kyj (520): Въ наррацїи выхваляй умерлого человѣка, выличаючи єго цноты и добрыи учинки, же заховал вѣру православную до конца живота своєго, же былъ милосердный на

is to show the presence of Christian virtues, and the mortification of sin, in the subject of the speech.

The treatment of structure in Galjatovs'kyj's "Nauka" is also typical of epideictic speech. Classical rhetoric allows for great freedom in the introduction of a speech;[165] likewise, Galjatovs'kyj gives several choices for the subject of the introduction. For Sunday sermons, the theme is taken from the Sunday Gospel readings.[166] For Festal sermons, the theme is drawn from various books of the Bible, including the Pentateuch, Psalms, Proverbs, Prophets, Epistles, the Gospels, and the Apocalypse.[167] Less frequently, Galjatovs'kyj suggests that a preacher may wish to choose a theme from non-Biblical sources, such as the Patristic writings or from Liturgical texts, such as *troparion* , *kontakion* , *stichera* , *sedalion*, *antiphon*, *theotokion* , or other Church hymns appropriate to the given feast day.[168] Another approach to theme, but according to Galjatovs'kyj, rarely done, is to construct a sermon without one. Two approaches are

---

людей убогих, спомагалъ ихъ ялмужною, святою, же накладал на церквы, на монастыри, на шпиталь, пріймовалъ въ домъ свой гостей, приходневъ, пелгрымов, выкуповалъ и вызволявъ неволникωвъ зъ неволь поганскои, же былъ покорнымъ, набожнымъ, часто ωчищалъ сумленьє своє сповѣдю святою и пріймовалъ пренайсвятьйшій сакраментъ єυхарістіей тѣла и крове Христовои, заховалъ посты, застаноялъся за Церковъ Божію и за ωтчызну, великіи працы и труды дла Церкви Божеи и для ωтчызну подыймовалъ.

165cf. Quintilian (III viii a).

166Galjatovs'kyj (516): Ґды въ недѣлю схочешъ казаньє повѣдати, ωзми ѳема зъ єυангеліи, которое читано было на Службѣ Божей, и ведлугъ тоси ѳемы учини казаньє.

167Galjatovs'kyj (516): Єсли зась въ свято схочешъ казаньє повѣдати, можещъ любъ зъ книгъ Мωυсеωвыхъ, любъ зъ ψалмωвъ Давидовыхъ, любъ зъ приповѣстей Соломωновыхъ, любъ зъ прорωка, албω апостола якого, любъ зъ єυангелїа, любъ зъ апокалиψи.

168Galjatovs'kyj (516): Єсли въ кототкомъ часѣ притрафиться великая и пилная потреба повѣдати казаньє, а не можешъ знайти ѳемы въ писмѣ Святомъ, въ Библіи, на той часъ можешъ взяти ѳему зъ Святого ωтца якого, учителя церковного, албо зъ тропаря албω зъ кондака, албω зъ стихиры, албω зъ сѣдалны, албω зъ антифωна, албω зъ догмата, албω зъ иншогω гимну церковного.

given: a first one in which theme is omitted entirely,[169] and a second one in which theme is substituted with a retelling of the Gospel reading.[170] Galjatovs'kyj, however, reminds his students that contemporary preachers never follow the first approach,[171] and very seldom follow the second.[172]

Aristotle suggests that in epideictic speech the orator has the choice of making the preliminary passages of the speech directly connected or disconnected with the speech itself.[173] Similarly, Galjatovs'kyj give several possibilities for connecting the theme of the *exordium* to the *narratio* . Firstly, he gives the possibility of a direct correlation between theme and *narratio* whereby the *narratio* is directly constructed upon the same scriptural text chosen for the theme; according to Galjatovs'kyj, this approach works the best.[174] In this approach the theme text is fragmentized and its various sub-parts are used to form the basis for the *narratio* .[175] Secondly, Galjatovs'kyj gives the possibility of indirectly correlating the theme of the *exordium* to the *narratio* , giving three different ways in which this may be done. The first manner in which an indirect correlation may be made is through the use of *exemplum* .[176] In this technique a theme text is given in the *exordium* , and then in the *narratio* the preacher gives direct examples of what the theme is about. The second technique takes the theme text and gives analogies, or similes which are related to the theme.[177] The third indirect approach involves taking a very lofty, sublime theme, and lowering it, expressing it in a way

---

[169]Galjatovs'kyj (516): Можетъ часом казанє быти и без ѳемы.

[170]Galjatovs'kyj (516): Можешъ повѣдати казаньє любо въ недѣлю, любо въ свято, толкуючи єуангелїє, которое читано было на Службѣ Божой.

[171]Galjatovs'kyj (516): але того стилю казнодѣи теперешного вѣку рѣдко заживают.

[172]Galjatovs'kyj (516): Але и того стилю казнодѣи теперешнего часу мало заживаютъ.

[173]cf. Aristotle, Rhetoric (1415a 1).

[174]Galjatovs'kyj (514): ѳѯордїум найлѣпшое будетъ, гды ѡное зъ самои ѳемы учинишъ.

[175]Galjatovs'kyj (514): Треба роздѣлити ѳему на части въ наррацыи и кождую часть ѳемы ѡсобнѡ повѣдати.

[176]Galjatovs'kyj (514): можешъ ѳѯордїум учинити зъ прикладу.

[177]Galjatovs'kyj (514): можешъ ѳѯордїум учинити зъ подобенства.

which makes it easier to comprehend.[178] Additionally, Galjatovs'kyj reminds his students that one theme may be used as the subject for many different sermons,[179] or that two themes may be used for one sermon (as in the case of feast days which coincide with Sundays).[180]

Regarding the structure of the *narratio* , Galjatovs'kyj allows for similar freedom of style. The point upon which he insists most of all, however, is that unity of theme must be maintained throughout the sermon: whatever ideas are introduced in the *exordium* must be followed up in the *narratio* . Likewise, nothing should be introduced in the *narratio* which does not relate to the original theme presented by the speaker in the *exordium* . Unity of theme is to be maintained in all three parts of the sermon: *exordium , narratio , and conclusio.*[181]

Another characteristic of Galjatovs'kyj's "Nauka" which borrows from classical theory of epideictic speech is the great attention which is paid to ornamentation as a means for delighting the audience. Galjatovs'kyj gives several techniques for "enticing the audience to listen" ("Повабити людей до слуханья"), including the promising of new and unusual ideas, the use of word play, apostrophe, epithets, metonymy, and *loci topici* . One way in which the preacher may move his listeners is by promising them something new and wonderful, which they have not seen nor heard of before.[182] Another technique involves word play, which is typical of the humanist *copia verborum* . Poetic effects may be achieved by playing with the letters of a subject's name (e.g. "Богъ же богатъ сый въ милости"), and Galjatovs'kyj suggests that it is possible to

---

[178]Galjatovs'kyj (514): Єξордїум можешъ часомъ написати, понижаючи себе, приписуючи собѣ недосконалость, слабость и неумѣстност.

[179]Galjatovs'kyj (514): Належит вѣдати, же зъ єдной ѳемы могутъ розныи двоє албо троє быти казанье.

[180]Galjatovs'kyj (516): Ґды притрафится свято якоє въ недѣлю...памятай тоє, жебы сѣ и Святого того на казанью своємъ хвалилъ и зъ недѣлногѡ єυангелїа що-колвекъ повѣдѣлъ.

[181]Galjatovs'kyj (513): Тыи всѣ части мают ся згажати зъ ѳемою...части, которыи ся въ казанью знайдуютъ, повинны ся зъ ѳемою зъгажати, жебы що ся въ ѳемѣ знайдустъ, тоє въ єξордїумъ, и въ наррацыи, и въ конклюзїи ся знайдовало.

[182]Galjatovs'kyj (515): Можешъ повабити людей до слуханья ѡбѣцати якую новую речъ показати, которои ѡни не видали и не чували.

organize an entire sermon based on the structure of such a word play.[183] Another technique is the use of apostrophe, whereby the preacher turns his attention to the individual who is the subject of the oration, and addresses him or her directly. Galjatovs'kyj suggests that a preacher may wish to call upon Jesus Christ, the Theotokos, or the Saints, as if they were present in the room, and beseech them for help.[184] Another ornamental technique recommended by Galjatovs'kyj is the use of epithets, or the giving of many different names for one thing (e.g. "Азъ єсмъ иже єсм(ъ) Господь Савао҃въ, востокъ, алфа и ѡмега, Іисус Христос").[185] Metonomy is another ornamental technique in which the preacher calls two different objects by the same name (e.g. "Церкою Сіѡнскою и Пречистая Дѣва называєтся").[186] Yet another technique is the use of *loci topici* , or extended associations between many different objects.[187] In his "Nauka", Galjatovs'kyj suggests the use of *loci topici* as a means of ornamenting sermons. One example he gives is a sermon on the feast of St. Nicholas, in which various precious stones are described; these stones are then associated with the decorative stones on St. Nicholas' mitre; and finally, the decorations on St. Nicholas' mitre are then associated with various virtues belonging to the Saint.[188] A similar example is found in his sermon for St. Onuphrius: various threads used for weaving are described; these threads are then associated with material for a garment which clothes St.

---

183 Galjatovs'kyj (515): Можешъ повабити людей до слуханья, тлумачачи якоє імя, и можешъ цілоє казанье часомъ зъ имени учинити.

184 Galjatovs'kyj (516): можешъ конклюзію въ казанью учинити, ѡбернувшися и мовячи до Христа, албо до Пречистои Дѣвы, албѡ до иншогѡ святогѡ.

185 Galjatovs'kyj (518): єдна речъ мнѡгими и розными именами называється.

186 Galjatovs'kyj (518): ведлугъ розмаитогѡ сенсу мнѡгіи и розъныи речи єдним ся именемъ называютъ.

187 For more on the use of *loci topici* in Ukrainian Baroque sermon writing, see Aleksandr Arxangel'skij, Iz lekcij po istorii russkoj literatury (Kazan 1913) 57.

188 Galjatovs'kyj (525): Въ наррацыи выличай тыи дорогіи каменъ - карбункулъ, ясписъ, шафѣръ, хризолѣтъ, берилъ, гагатокъ, аметист, шмарагдъ, топазіѡнъ, магнесъ, которыи каменъ Святый Ніколай въ коронѣ своєй мастъ и кождого каменя натуру власности и скутки аппликуй до Святого Ніколая.

Onuphrius (who is portrayed nude in icons); and finally the threads of this garment are associated with the Saint's virtues.[189]

Ioannykij Galjatovs'kyj's "Nauka, albo sposob złożenja kazanja", faithfully adheres to the Renaissance interpretation of the principles of epideictic speech as formulated by Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian. Just as continuity is observed from the classical tradition of demonstrative oratory to the homiletical theory of Galjatovs'kyj, a further progression will be seen in the Ukrainian sermons of Dymytrij Tuptalo. Galjatovs'kyj articulated a theory for sermon writing, a theory which was welcomed throughout the East Slavic world. Tuptalo's Ukrainian sermons demonstrate the practical application of this theory in the crafting of sacred orations of exquisite beauty.

189Galjatovs'kyj (525): Въ наррацыи выличай тыи нитки - лняную, волняную, єдвабнию, золотую, зъ которыхъ Святый Онофрїй уткалъ собѣ шату, кождои нитки власности и скутки аппликуй до Святогѡ Онофрїю.

Chapter Three: Biography of Dymytrij Tuptalo

Dymytrij (secular name: Danylo) Tuptalo was born in December, 1651 in the town of Makarov, on the right-bank of the Dniepr river, near Kiev. His parents were Savva Hryhorovyč and Marija Myxajlivna Tuptalo. His father was a captain ("sotnyk") in the Cossack army and belonged to the gentry. His biographer, Nečaev, suggets that, Danylo, coming from a wealthy family, was surrounded by books and benefited from a primary education at home.[190]

In the year 1662, at the age of 11, Tuptalo entered the Kiev Collegium. While attending this institution, he benefited not only from a systematic appproach to the art of rhetoric, but also from the influence of Ioannykij Galjatovs'kyj, who was at that time rector.[191] He spent three years at the Kiev school, but was unable to complete his studies due to it's temporary closure by Hetman Petro Dorošenko in 1665.[192] Some scholars believe that Tuptalo, although unable to officially complete the program in rhetoric, was probably able to master most of it, either through independent study or with the aid of tutors skilled in Latin.[193] His command of rhetorical theory is evident in his sermons themselves,

---

190V. Nečaev (Bishop Vissarion), Svjatyj Dimitrij, Mitropolit Rostovskij (Moskva [Moscow], 1910) 5.

191Viktor Askočenskij, Kiev s drevnějšim ego učiliščem akademieju (Kiev, 1856) 219.

192The closure of the school was due to the current unstable political situation: the city of Kiev was passing from Polish jurisdiction to Muscovite control. See Bulgakov 46-47.

193Scholars disagree over the possible extent of Tuptalo's training in rhetoric. Feodor Titov, K istorii Kievskoj duxovnoj Akademii (Kiev, 1910) 178, believes that Tuptalo's three-year stay at the Collegium was long enough to give him sufficient training in rhetoric. I. Šljapkin 6, and Vitalij Ejngorn, O snošenijax malorossijskago duxovenstva s Moskovskim Pravitelstvom v carstvovanie Alekséja Mixajloviča (Moskva [Moscow], 1890) 323, suggest that the closing of the Collegium in 1665 did not necessarily put an end to intellectual life in Kiev; between 1666-1668 scholarly activities and intellectual pursuits continued on with little interruption. Therefore, it would have been possible for Tuptalo to finish his training in rhetoric without much difficulty. Metropolitan Ilarion (Ohienko), Svjatyj Dymytrij Tuptalo - joho žyttja i pracja (Winnipeg: Christian Press, 1960) 23, similarly suggests that following the closure of the Collegium, Savva Hryhorovyč Tuptalo could easily have engaged a private tutor to continue his son's education at home. The "Zasédanie Černigovskoj gubernskoj učenoj arxivnoj kommissii, posvjaščenoj pamjati svjatitelja Dimitrija, Mitropolita Rostovskago."Trudy Černigovskoj gubernskoj učenoj arxivnoj kommissii 8 (1911): 12, even suggests that courses in rhetoric at the Collegium may have resumed as early as 1666.

whose high quality and effective use of rhetorical elements bear witness to an author well-trained in the art of sacred oration.[194]

Two years after the closing of the Collegium, he entered St. Cyril's Monastery in Kiev, an institution with which the Tuptalo family had been long associated and of which his father was a noted patron. On July 5, 1668, he was given the monastic tonsure at the hand of Meletij Dzyk, who was at the time hegumen[195] of the monastery, and received the monastic name of Dymytrij (in Church Slavonic: Dimitrij). 8 months later, on March 25, 1669 he traveled to Kaniv to be ordained a deacon by Metropolitan Josyf Neljubovyč Tukal's'kyj.[196]

Tuptalo remained at St. Cyril's Monastery for a total of 6 years. In 1675 he was called to Černihiv by Archbishop Lazar Baranovyč.[197] On the 23 of May, 1675, at the age of 25, he was ordained into the priesthood at the Hustyns'kyj Monastery, near the town of Pryluky, in Černihiv eparchy, by Baranovyč himself. Following his ordination into the priesthood, Tuptalo was called to pursue a career as a preacher ("kaznodij").[198] At Baranovyč's request, he spent two years in Černihiv,

---

[194]F. Titov 178.

[195]In Slavic Eastern Churches, the title hegumen is used to designate the abbot or superior of a monastic institution.

[196]Tuptalo's decision to be ordained in Kaniv had political implications. The Muscovite authorities in Kiev refused to recognize Tukals'kyj, who had been elected Metropolitan by the clergy and noble families in Kiev. In 1664, the Muscovites had appointed their own candidate, Mefodij Fylymonovyč, Bishop of Mscislaul', as Metropolitan, and in 1668, Lazar Baranovyč, Archbishop of Černihiv, was appointed as Mefodij's successor. Consequently, at the time of Tuptalo's ordination, there were two rivals for the Kievan Metropolitanate: Tukals'kyj in Kaniv, and Baranovyč in Kiev. Tuptalo's choice to be ordained by Tukals'kyj readily identified him with a sizeable group of clergy who resisted growing Muscovite control over the Orthodox Church in Left-bank Ukraine, including Meletij Dzyk, Varlaam Jasyns'kyj, Feodosij Baevs'kyj (in Belorussia), and Tukals'kyj himself. In his lifetime, Tuptalo was to remain closely associated with the above-mentioned individuals and with Ukrainian resistance to Muscovite domination in ecclesiastical affairs. See Nečaev 7-8. Also, Myxajlo Voznjak, Istorija ukrains'koi literatury, vol. 2, (L'viv, 1921) 21.

[197]Baranovyč was one of the strongest supporters of the movement to bring the Ukrainian Church under the control of the Moscow Patriarch. Despite their disagreement over this issue, however, he and Tuptalo remained good friends; Baranovyč had great admiration for Tuptalo's skill as a sermon writer. See Sumcov, Lazar Baranovič, (Xar'kov' [Xarkiv], 1885) 50-51.

[198]The role of the preacher in seventeenth century Ukrainian society was not a minor one. From the decline of Kiev-Rus' until the late sixteenth century, sermons were rarely heard in Ukrainian churches; in their place, the clergy read lessons from the Church Fathers or the

delivering sermons at the Černihiv Cathedral and in other churches of the Černihiv eparchy. During this period, also at Baranovyč's request, he wrote his first published work, Runo orošennoe. This is a collection which consists of 22 (later, 2 more were added) narratives with accompanying commentaries describing the miracles attributed to the miraculous icon of the Theotokos found at the St. Elias (Il'ins'kyj) Holy Trinity Monastery in Černihiv. First printed in Černihiv in 1680, Runo orošennoe became immensely popular, and a second printing followed in 1683.[199]

While serving in Černihiv, Tuptalo's fame as preacher grew, not only in the Černihiv eparchy itself, but throughout Left and Right-Bank Ukraine, Lithuania, and Belorussia. On July 31, 1677, with Baranovyč's blessing, he left Černihiv and embarked on a journey which took him to Volhynia, Lithuania, and Belorussia.[200] In August he visited the Monastery in Novyj Dvir, in Volhynia, where he participated in the transferring of the Monastery's miraculous icon of the Theotokos from the old Monastery Church into the new on August 14, 1677. He then left Volhynia and traveled to Vilnius at the request of Klyment Tryzna, hegumen of the Vilnius Holy Spirit Monastery, where he was invited to preach. On November 24 of that year, he left Vilnius and travelled to Slutsk, in Belorussia, at the invitiation of the Slutsk Confraternity. He then spent 14 months in Slutsk, delivering sermons at the Holy Transfiguration Monastery. While in Slutsk, he became close friends with Bishop Feodosij Baevs'kyj and Ioan Skočkevyč, individuals known for their opposition to the Moscow Patriarchate's attempt to assume greater control over the

---

Lives of the Saints. In the 1600's, however, with the growth of the Confraternity schools, and with the study of rhetoric within these schools, the art of sermon-writing experienced a dramatic rebirth. Every monastery, cathedral, and Confraternity church, which had the means to do so, supported its own professional preacher, whose sole responsibility was to write and deliver sermons for Sundays and Feastdays. Among the most well-known preachers of the period were Kyrylo Trankvilion Stavrovec'kyj and Tarasij Zemka, both of whom were appointed to preach at the Caves' Monastery. For more on Tuptalo and his role as a preacher, see Nečaev 110-112.

[199]Aleksandr Pypin, Istorija russkoj literatury, vol. 2 (Sanktpeterburg [St. Petersburg], 1907) 382. Interestingly, the second printing of Runo orošennoe included verses written by Tuptalo in Polish, testifying to the author's ablility to compose in that language. See Jabłonowski 156.

[200]For more on Tuptalo's travels to Volhynia, Lithuania, and Belorussia, see Šljapkin 20-24, Askočenskij 220-221, and Nečaev 12-16.

Ukrainian and Belorussian Churches.[201] Baevs'kyj died in November, 1678, and Tuptalo preached the eulogy at his funeral in Lublin.[202] On January 29, 1679, following Skočkevyč's death, he left Slutsk and returned to Ukraine at the request of Lazar Baranovyč and Hetman Samojlovyč. Tuptalo's extensive travels in the various regions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, however, doubtless left a great impression on him, having given him the opportunity to become better acquainted with Polish and West European Culture, the Polish language, Roman Catholicism, and the Orthodox Church in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.[203]

In February of 1679 he settled in Baturyn, at the Krupyc'kyj St. Nicholas Monastery. He served as priest of this Monastery for one year and 7 months. In the summer of 1681, the brethren of the St. Cyril's monastery in Kiev unanimously requested that Tuptalo be appointed their hegumen. On September 4 of that same year, however, Baranovyč named Tuptalo hegumen of the Maksakovs'kyj Holy Transfiguration Monastery. He was to stay at the Maksakovs'kyj Monastery for only a short period, however, because on March 1, 1682, he was called back to Baturyn and appointed hegumen of the Krupyc'kyj St. Nicholas Monastery.

On October 26, 1683, he took a leave of absence from his administrative duties and went into seclusion in a hermitage not far from the Krupyc'kyj Monastery. At this time, Varlaam Jasyns'kyj, Archimandrite of the Kiev Caves' Monastery, approached him with the idea of writing a Četi-Minei ("Reading Menaion").[204] On April 23, 1684,

---

[201] Askočenskij 220, Pypin 382.

[202] Peter A. Rolland, "'Dulce est et fumos videre Patriae' - Four Letters by Simiaon Polacki." Harvard Ukrainian Studies 9 (1985): 173.

[203] Pypin 383.

[204] In the Eastern Church, two types of Menaia are used: the Festal Menaion (in Greek, Μηναια, from μην, meaning 'month') consisting of twelve volumes arranged according to the months of the year and containing liturgical readings and hymns for Feasts and Saints' Days, and the Reading Menaion, or Lives of the Saints, containing non-liturgical texts used for homiletical purposes and for private devotions. Like the Festal Menaion, the Reading Menaion is arranged according to the months of the year. Prior to Tuptalo, the Ukrainian Church did not have its own, complete collection of Saints' Lives. Sylvester Kosiv had translated the Kievan Caves' Monastery Paterik (Lives of the Monastery's Fathers) into Polish, and Josyf Tryzna made additions to this text in Slavonic. As well, Lazar Baranovyč had written a Četi-Minei in Polish. Petro Mohyla attempted to translate Simeon Metaphrastes' Lives from Greek into Slavonic, but did not finish. The most recent attempt prior to Tuptalo was initiated by Innokentij Gizel', who borrowed Metropolitan Makarij's Muscovite Minei (compiled between 1530-1554) and attempted to rewrite it in

he left Baturyn and moved to Kiev, where he spent the next year and 7 months at the Caves' Monastery, working on the Minei.[205] Tuptalo's stay at the Caves' Monastery was another great influence on his intellectual development. Here, he had access to the monastery's immense library and the opportunity to work among Kiev's most gifted scholars, including Jasyns'kyj himself, who greatly encouraged Tuptalo's literary pursuits.[206] On February 9, 1686, however, at the request of the Hetman, he was called to Baturyn for the third time, and once again appointed hegumen of the Krupyc'kyj Monastery, in which capacity he was to remain for the next eight years and 4 months.[207] Despite his many administrative duties, he was able to concentrate on completing the first part of the Minei (for the months of September, October, and November).

Part One of the Minei was completed in the year 1689, and with Varlaam Jasyns'kyj's blessing, it was printed at the Kievan Caves' Monastery Press.[208] Unfortunately, the book was first printed without asking for Patriarch Joakim's approval.[209] Joakim ordered that the printing of the book be stopped, and Tuptalo was required to appear in Moscow and officially ask for the Patriarch's blessing.[210] That same year, Tuptalo traveled to Moscow with Hetman Ivan Mazepa's entourage, eventually securing Patriarch Joakim's approval for the Minei.[211] Unfortunately, Tuptalo's request to the Patriarch that he be lent a copy of Metropolitan Makarij's Minei to assist him in his work was turned down.[212] While in Moscow, he and his colleagues, Innokentij Monastyrs'kyj and Stefan Javors'kyj,[213] were involved in the defense of

---

Ukrainian Church Slavonic. However, Makarij's Minei was written in Muscovite *skoropis'* (cursive script), which nobody in Kiev was able to read, and so it remained untranslated. See Pypin 384.

[205]Askočenskij 221.

[206]Pypin 383.

[207]Askočenskij 221.

[208]Askočenskij 222.

[209]Voznjak 345.

[210]E. Poseljanin, Russkaja cerkov i russkie podvižniki (Sanktpeterburg [St. Petersburg], 1905) 37.

[211]Askočenskij 222.

[212]Pypin386.

[213]For more on Tuptalo and Javors'kyj's meeting with Patriarch Joakim and the Muscovite clergy, see Filipp Ternovskij's "Mitropolit Stefan Javorskyj." Trudy Kievskoj

Kievan liturgical books and Kievan liturgical theology concerning the doctrine of the Transubstantiation.[214]

He returned to Baturyn, and continued to work on the Minei. The new Patriarch, Adrijan, was much more supportive, commending Tuptalo for his work and arranging for a copy of Metropolitan Makarij's Minei to be sent to him from Moscow. Completion of the second part of the Minei (for the months of December, January, and February) was delayed, due to his appointment as hegumen of the St. Peter and Paul Monastery in Hluxiv, in June of 1694.[215]

Tuptalo spent two years in Hluxiv, where he was occupied in the construction of a new, stone Cathedral for the monastery, which he himself consecrated in 1697.[216] In the meantime, the second part of the Minei was completed, and sent for printing at the Caves' Monastery in 1695. In mid-January of 1697, his friend, Innokentij Monastyrs'kyj, hegumen of St. Cyril's Monastery in Kiev, died. Tuptalo left Hluxiv and returned to Kiev, where he served as a hegumen of St. Cyril's Monastery for four and one-half months. In June of that year he was transferred to the Elec'kyj Holy Dormition Monastery in Černihiv, where, on June 20, 1697, at the age of 46, he was ordained an archimandrite.[217] He was to serve as the archimandrite of the Elec'kyj Monastery for 2 years and 3 months. On September 17, 1699, he was appointed to the Holy Transfiguration

---

Duxovnoj Akademii 1,3 (1864): 65. See also, Grigorij Mirkovič, O vremeni presuščestvlenija Sv. Darov (Vil'na [Vilnius], 1886) 22,23,89,91,243-245.

[214]The debate centered on the Kievan interpretation of the *epiklesis* or invoking of the Holy Spirit during the consecration of the bread and wine. Liturgical books published in Kiev were influenced by Latin models, which associated the action of the Holy Spirit with the words of the celebrating priest, "Take, eat, this is my Body...". The Muscovite Church, in keeping with Eastern Theology, made no such association. The text of Tuptalo's defence of Kievan liturgical theology is found in Mirkovič appendix I-XXVI. For an analysis of Tuptalo's theological teachings on the Sacrament of Holy Communion, see Metropolitan Makarij (Bulgakov), "Sv. Dimitrija Rostovskago svjatitelja i čudotvorca, dogmatičeskoe učenie, vybranoe iz ego sočinenij." Xristianskoe čtenie, izd. pri Sanktpeterburgskoj Duxovnoj akademii 4 (1842): 467-469.

[215]Askočenskij 223.

[216]"Zasědanie Černigovskoj gubernskoj učenoj arxivnoj..." 24-25 gives a description of this church, with an accompanying photograph.

[217]In the Orthodox Church an archimandrite is the superior of a major monastic institution; his position in the Ecclesiastical hierarchy is above that of an hegumen. The office of archimandrite is customarily the stepping-stone to becoming a bishop.

Monastery in Novhorod Sivers'kyj, where he was to remain until February, 1701. During this time he completed the third part of the Minei (for the months of March, April, and May), which was printed in the year 1700.[218]

In February, 1701, he was summoned to Moscow by the Emperor Peter I.[219] On March 23, of that year, he was consecrated a bishop and named Metropolitan of Tobolsk and Siberia. Tuptalo, however, remained in Moscow for nine months. Frail health forced him to delay his transfer to Siberia. On January 4, 1702, he was given a new appointment, that of Metropolitan of Rostov (Rostov Velikij, located north-east of Moscow).[220]

He arrived in Rostov on March 1, 1702, and immediately took up his episcopal duties. He resided at the St. Jacob ("Yakovlevskij") Holy Transfiguration Monastery, to which he became closely attached.[221] Upon arriving in Rostov, Tuptalo was appalled at the ignorance and indifference of the clergy toward spiritual matters and the widespread demoralization among the laity.[222] He blamed the clergy, and in particular, their lack of

---

[218]Askočenskij 223.

[219]Tuptalo was one of a number of Ukrainian clergy who were brought to Muscovy by Peter as part of his attempt to westernize his Empire and to stimulate intellectual activity in the North. Ternovskij 40, identifies Symeon Poloc'kyj, Dmytro Tuptalo, Stefan Javors'kyj, Feofilakt Lopatyns'kyj, and Feofan Prokopovyč as among the important Ukrainian clergy active in Muscovy. Ternovs'kij characterizes the Ukrainian clerics as being strong opponents of Protestantism. He, however, also perceives them as heavily influenced by Roman Catholicism, and, on the other hand, as enthusiastic supporters of Peter's reforms. The latter perception was governed by the fact that the Kievan cultural mileu had already welcomed Western European ideas and cultural influences. Other scholars, among them, A. Tračevskij, N. Vasilenko, and A. Pypin, similarly identify Tuptalo as one of the most important promoters of Kievan learning into Muscovy. For the first one, see: Aleksandr Tračevskij, Russkaja istorija (Sanktpeterburg [St. Petersburg]: 1895) 131-132; for the second: Nikolaj Vasilenko, "Dimitrij Rostovskij i ego literaturnaja dějatel'nost'." Čtenija v Istoričeskom obščestvě Nestora Lětopisca 22 (1912): 80-83; for the third: Pypin 392.

[220]Mixail Tolstoj, in Drevnija Svjatyni Rostova-Velikago (Moskva [Moscow], 1860) 25, identifies Tuptalo chronologically as the 54th hierarch of Rostov.

[221]Andrej Titov, in Rostov Velikij i ego svjatyni (Sankpeterburg [St. Petersburg], 1895) 48-50 gives a detailed description of St. Jacob's Monastery in Rostov, paying special attention to Dymytrij Tuptalo's period of residence there.

[222]Vladimir Peretc, Istoriko-literaturnyja izslědovanija i materialy iz istorii russkoj pěsni (Sanktpeterburg [St. Petersburg], 1900) 109, quotes Tuptalo: "Священническій чинъ окрестъ престола Божія безъ страха Божія и безъ боязни стоитъ...клирицы чтутъ и поютъ безъ вниманія, священники со діаконы во олтари сквернословлятъ, а иногда и деруться."

education. He likened them to "a sower who fails to sow, and so the soil does not accept the seeds."[223] To alleviate the situation, he founded a school in Rostov for the purpose of training better educated clerics. Tuptalo's Rostov school was modeled on the Ukrainian Latin schools, using Latin as the language of instruction and making extensive use of Classical texts.[224] Tuptalo hired students and graduates of the Kiev Collegium to teach in Rostov, thus promoting even further Ukrainian domination over the intellectual life of his eparchy.[225]

While in Rostov he encountered considerable resistance to the Nikonian reforms among Old Believers. During this period he wrote his polemical tract, Rozysk o raskol'ničeskoj Brynskoj věrě, which defended the Nikonian reforms and sharply denounced the Old Believers.[226] Among his literary pursuits in Rostov was the writing of the Lětopis ("Chronicle"), a historical document which was left unfinished after his death,[227] and the co-authorship, with Feofan Prokopovyč, of a collection of Psalms. During the next 3 years he was able to complete the fourth and final part of the Minei (for June, July, and August), which was printed in May of 1705, at the Caves' Monastery.

Tuptalo was to remain in Rostov a total of 6 years and 10 months, until his death on October 28, 1709, at the age of 58.[228] At his request he was buried in the ancient Cathedral Church of the Conception of St. Anne ("Sobornaja cerkov' vo imja Začatija Sv. Anny"), at the St. Jacob Monastery.[229] On November 25, his close friend, Stefan Javorsk'yj, Metropolitan of Rjazan and *locum tenens* of the Patriarchal seat, visited

---

[223]Poseljanin 39: "Сѣятель не сѣетъ, а земля не принимаетъ. Iереи не брегутъ, а люди заблуждаются. Iереи не учатъ, а люди не вѣжествуютъ. Iереи слова Божія не проповѣдуютъ, а люди не слушаютъ и слушать не хотятъ."

[224]According to Peretc 34,64, the primary textbooks for grammar and poetics used by Tuptalo in his Rostov school were Alvarez' Grammar and De syllabarum dimensione.

[225]Peretc 208.

[226]Andrej Titov, in "Svjatyj Dimitrij Mitropolit Rostovskij." Russkij Arxiv 2 (1895): 5-16, describes in detail Tuptalo's conflict with Old Believers in his eparchy.

[227]Askočenskij 224. A description of this text is found in Andrej Titov's Keleinyj lětopisec Sv. Dimitrija Mitropolita Rostovskago (Moskva [Moscow], 1892).

[228]Askočenskij 226.

[229]The inscription on his grave in the St. Anne church is given in Tolstoj 55-56.

the grave and delivered the eulogy.[230] Upon his death, Tuptalo left behind few personal effects except for his large library.[231] Stefan Javors'kyj removed Tuptalo's collection of books from Rostov and deposited them in the library of the Moscow Patriarchate.[232]

On the 21st of September, 1752, Tuptalo's grave was reopened, and his relics were observed to have been uncorrupted.[233] On April 1, 1757, he was canonized by the Russian Orthodox Church as St. Dimitrij of Rostov. In connection with this celebration, Liturgical hymns and a Church service to St. Dimitrij of Rostov were composed by Metropolitan Arsenij Macievyč of Rostov and Archimandrite Bonifatij Borec'kyj of the Tolga Monastery (both these individuals hailed from Western Ukraine).[234] The Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church declared that two feastdays of St. Dimitrij of Rostov were to be commemorated in the Church calendar, on September 21 (the uncovering of his relics) and on October 28 (the day of his death). In 1801 a new church, at the expense of Count Nikolaj Šermetev, was constructed within the grounds of the St. Jacob Monastery and dedicated to St. Dimitrij of Rostov.[235] The next year

---

230The text of Javors'kyj's epitaph placed on Tuptalo's grave is found in Ternovskij 289.

231According to Tolstoj 32,37, the only personal effects of Tuptalo which remained in Rostov were his episcopal *panagija* (pectoral icon of the Theotokos) and *posox* (staff), which remained in the treasury of the Metropolitan Cathedral of the Holy Dormition, within the walls of the city's kremlin. His collection of books, however, consisted of more than 300 volumes, according to Boris von Eding, in Rostov Velikij, Uglič - pamjatniki xudožestvennoj stariny (Moskva [Moscow], 1913) 36. A list of Tuptalo's books, catalogued after his death, is found in Šljapkin, appendix 54-58.

232Ternovskij 289. Aleksandr Nikolskij, in "Něskolko slov o žitii i sočinenijax svjatogo Dimitrija Rostovskago." Izvěstija otdělenija russkago jazika i slovesnosti imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk 14 (1910): 160-171, lists locations of manuscripts of Tuptalo's works and where they are found, primarily in the Library of the Russian Orthodox Holy Synod (now the Library of the Moscow Patriarchate) and the Imperial Public Library in St. Petersburg (now the M.E. Saltykov-Ščedrin State Public Library in Leningrad).

233Uncorruptibility of human remains is considered by the Eastern Church to be a sign of sainthood. According to Eding 129, and Tolstoj 53, when Tuptalo was exhumed, his oak casket was observed to have been completely rotted, while the deceased's body and clothing were uncorrupted.

234Metropolitan Ilarion (Ohienko), Svjatyj Dymytrij Tuptalo 208.

235An extensive description of the architecture of this church, with accompanying photographs is found in Eding 130-135.

Tuptalo's remains were transferred to this church, where they were to remain.[236]

Tuptalo's major works were all published during his own lifetime: Runo orošennoe (1680,1683, 1689,1691, 1696, 1697, 1702), the Četi-Minei (1689, 1695, 1700, 1702, 1705), and his Rozysk o raskol'ničeskoj Brynskoj věrě (1707). Additionally, the above works all went through many reprintings in the two centuries following Tuptalo's death.[237] In 1804, in Moscow, a collection of Tuptalo's previously unpublished works was released under the title, Ostal'nyja sočinenija Sv. Dimitrija, Mitropolita Rostovskago Čudotvorca, doselě světu ešče neizvěstnyja.[238] Other publications of Tuptalo's lesser-known works followed, based on unpublished manuscripts and on the 1804 Ostal'nyja sočinenija. By the end of the nineteenth century, most of Tuptalo's works, written in Church Slavonic, had become widely available.[239] As for his Ukrainian works, they remained virtually unknown, until Andrej Titov, in 1909, published eight Ukrainian sermons, under the title, Propovědi Svjatitelja Dimitrija, Mitropolita Rostovskago, na ukrainskom naréčii. Their appearance allowed readers to reacquaint themselves with a part of Tuptalo's personality which had been almost forgotten, that of a Ukrainian writer and orator.

---

[236]Color photographs, dating from 1913, of the interior of this church and of Tuptalo's shrine are found in Robert Allhouse, ed., Photographs for the Tsar - the Pioneering Color Photography of Sergei Mikhailovich Prokudin-Gorskii (New York: The Dial Press, 1980) 112,115. The church of St. Dimitrij of Rostov at the St. Jacob Monastery still stands, a comparatively recent photograph of it may be seen in Archbishop Pitirim of Volokamsk, ed., The Orthodox Church in Russia (London: Thames and Hudson, 1982).

[237]For a list of all publications of Tuptalo's works prior to 1960, see Leonid Maxnovec', Ukrains'ki pys'mennyky - bio-bibliohrafičnyj slovnyk vol. 1 (Kyiv [Kiev], 1960) 569-576.

[238]Metropolitan Ilarion (Ohienko), Svjatyj Dymytrij Tuptalo 164.

[239]For a complete list of all of Tuptalo's works, with accompanying descriptions, see Metropolitan Ilarion (Ohienko), Svjatyj Dymytrij Tuptalo 165-174.

Chapter Four: Tuptalo's Ukrainian Sermons

Andrej Titov's Propovědi Svjatitelja Dimitrija, Mitropolita Rostovskago, na ukrainskom naréčii was a project to commemorate the bicentennial of Dymytrij Tuptalo's death. Titov's reason for initiating the project, as stated in his introduction,[240] was make readers more familiar with Tuptalo's Ukrainian period of literary activity. Prior to Titov's publication of the Ukrainian sermons, scholars played little attention to Tuptalo's works written before 1701. Most of the sermons found in Titov's collection had indeed been previously published, but in later, Muscovite, Church Slavonic translations. Titov acquired all surviving witnesses of the Ukrainian sermons from private collections between 1891-93. At the same time, Titov asked Nikolaj Petrov to gather all copies of Tuptalo's Ukrainian sermons found in the Library of the Kiev Theological Academy. After comparing their research, Titov and Petrov then edited the sermons, forming a single text. Extensive corrections were required, particularly when noting Biblical quotations (e.g. some quotations were fragmented, others were in Latin, and some were missing entirely). After publishing the collected sermons in the year 1909, Titov donated his collection of original manuscripts to the Imperial Public Library in St. Petersburg, now known as the M.E. Saltykov-Ščedrin State Public Library in Leningrad.[241]

The first sermon in Titov's anthology is Tuptalo's Sermon on the 6th Sunday after Pascha.[242] No date and no location for this sermon is given. Titov's redaction of this sermon is based on three Ukrainian manuscripts found in his collection: No.'s 1277 (folios 109-115), 1280 (fol. 36-40), and 1286 (fol.191-202). A fourth Ukrainian witness (No. 1293) is found in an 1857 Church Slavonic publication of Tuptalo's works.[243]

---

[240] A. Titov i-ii.

[241] Nikolaj Rožděstvenskij, Spravočnik-ukazatel' pečatnyx opisanij slavjano-russkix rukopisej (Moskva [Moscow]: Akademija Nauk, 1963) 108-109.

[242] Titov erroneously identifies this sermon as a Sermon for the 7th Sunday after Pascha. In the Church Calendar there is no Seventh Sunday after Pascha - the seventh Sunday following Pascha is Trinity Sunday (Pentecost). As well, the theme of this sermon (John 17;2) is taken directly the Gospel reading for the 6th Sunday after Pascha.

[243] Sočinenija Svjatitelja Dimitrija, Mitropolita Rostovskago vol. 2 (Moskva [Moscow], 1857) 238-251.

The second work is the Sermon on the Descent of the Holy Spirit. This sermon was preached in Kiev, at St. Cyril's Monastery, on Holy Spirit Monday, 1693. Two Ukrainian witnesses are found in Titov's collection: No.'s 1277 (fol. 117-126) and 1286 (fol. 203-220). A third Ukrainian witness is taken from an 1884 publication of Tuptalo's Church Slavonic Sermon for Trinity Sunday.[244]

The third Ukrainian sermon is the Sermon on Trinity Sunday. This sermon was preached in Baturyn, on Trinity Sunday, 1698. Titov's collection has three Ukrainian witnesses of this sermon: No.'s 1277 (fol. 126-135), 1280 (fol. 40-48), and 1294 (fol. 135-154). A fourth witness is also found in the 1857 Sočinenija.[245]

The fourth sermon is on the 27th Sunday after Pentecost. The date and location of this sermon are unknown. Titov found only one witness of this sermon in Ukrainian, No. 1289 (fol. 24-37). According to Titov, the authorship of this work is confirmed by a comparison with Tuptalo's Church Slavonic Sermon for the 13th Sunday after Pentecost,[246] with which it shares a similar introductory section. As well, certain stylistic features, such as the frequent use of apostrophe, which is typical of Tuptalo, also bear witness to his authorship.

The fifth sermon is Tuptalo's Sermon on the Dormition of the Theotokos. This sermon was preached in Kiev, at the Caves' Monastery, on August 15, 1693. Only one witness exists in Titov's collection of Ukrainian sermons, No. 1285 (fol. 395-419).

The sixth sermon in the anthology is the Sermon on the Nativity of Jesus Christ. Four Ukrainian witnesses of this sermon are found in Titov's collection: No.'s 1277 (fol. 498-505), 1280 (fol. 242-251), 1284 (fol. 1-14), and 1285 (fol. 255-272). A fifth witness, No. 1294 (fol. 154-172), is found in the 1857 Sočinenija.[247]

The seventh sermon is the Sermon on the Feastday of St. Michael the Archangel. It was preached in Kiev, at the Cathedral of St. Michael's Monastery of the Golden Cupolas (Zolotoverxyj Myxajlivs'kyj Sobor), on

---

[244]E. Barsov, "Slovo Svjatitelja Dimitrija, Mitropolita Rostovskago, v den' Svjatyja Trojcy." Čtenij v Obščestvě Istorii i Drevnostej Rossijskyx 2 (1884): 82-106.

[245]Sočinenija vol. 2 (1857) 270-293.

[246]Sočinenija vol. 2 (1857) 432 ff.

[247]Sočinenija vol. 3 (1857) 445-469.

November 8, 1697 (the date coincided with the 23rd Sunday after Pentecost). Three Ukrainian witnesses are found in Titov's collection: No.'s 1277 (fol. 267-275), 1280 (fol. 147-154), and 1283 (fol. 83-92). A fourth witness, No. 1293 (fol. 177-194), is also found in the 1857 Sočinenija.[248]

The last sermon to be included in Titov's anthology is Tuptalo's Oration on the Second Anniversary of the Death of Innokentij Gizel'. This is the oldest of Tuptalo's surviving sermons. It was preached in Kiev, at the Caves' Monastery, on February 24, 1685. Three Ukrainian witnesses are found in Titov's collection: No.'s 1277 (fol. 365-380), and 1280 (fol. 252-269). A fourth witness, No. 1294 (fol. 173-202), is taken from the 1857 Sočinenija.[249]

Tuptalo's Ukrainian sermons demonstrate a practical application of Classical rhetoric, according to Galjatovs'kyj's interpretation of homiletical theory. Upon examination of individual rhetorical elements within these works, a close adherence to the homiletical principles of Galjatovs'kyj's Kliuč razuměnija will be seen in Tuptalo's own writing. In addition to demonstrating the three rhetorical principles of *inventio* , *dispositio* , and *elocutio* , Tuptalo's sermons also display typical features of epideictic or ceremonial discourse, all of which are described in the Galjatovs'kyj's "Nauka, albo sposob złożenja kazanja."

Tuptalo's sources for inventio are divided into three groups: Biblical, Patristic, and secular. Biblical sources, by far the largest group, are taken from a wide selection of Old and New Testament texts. Patristic sources include various sermons and epistles to whom authorship by a specific Father is directly attributed, as well as Church hymnography and hagiographic literature, of which Church Fathers were indeed authors, but are less frequently mentioned by name. Secular material in Tuptalo's sermons is primarily drawn from historical texts, including Classical Greek and Roman mythology.

Tuptalo's Biblical sources for *inventio* come from both Old and New Testament texts.[250] This is entirely in keeping with Galjatovs'kyj's

---

[248] Sočinenija vol. 3 (1857) 553-573.
[249] Sočinenija vol. 3 (1857) 574-612.
[250] See Appendix for a list of Biblical quotations from the sermons.

theory, which demands that the Bible be the first source from which the preacher draws his material.[251] The Biblical sources most frequently quoted in his works are the Gospels, St. Paul's Epistles, and the Psalms. The predominance of these books over others is not surprising, given that these are the most frequently read Biblical texts in the Byzantine cycle of worship.

Along with the Bible, Tuptalo draws from the second most important source mentioned by Galjatovs'kyj, the Church Fathers.[252] Tuptalo's most frequently quoted Patristic writer is St. John Chrysostom, the most well-known of all Christian orators.[253] Other Church Fathers whom Tuptalo mentions in these sermons include St. John of Damascus, St. Augustine of Hippo, St. Jerome,[254] St. Basil the Great, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Gregory of Neocaesarea, St. Metrophanes of Constantinople, St. Stephan the Sabaite, St. George of Nicomedia, St. Isidore of Pelusium, St. Germanus the Hymnographer, St. Theophilactus of Nicomedia, and St. Gregory the Decapolite.

In addition to direct quotations taken from the writings of the Church Fathers, frequent references are made to Church Hymnography. The quotation from St. Metrophanes of Constantinople[255] is taken from the third tone of the *octo-echos* , to which his authorship is attributed. A quote from St. John of Damascus in the Gizel' oration[256] is similarly taken from one of the Saint's hymns. The theme for the Sermon on the

---

[251]cf. Galjatovs'kyj (519).

[252]cf. Galjatovs'kyj (519).

[253]See Appendix for a list of quotations from the Church Fathers in the sermons.

[254]Augustine is mentioned twice in the sermons: in the Sermon on the Dormition (66) and in the Sermon on the Nativity (89). Jerome is mentioned once, in the Gizel' Oration (131). Tuptalo's use of Augustine and Jerome was unacceptable to the Muscovites. However, within the Ukrainian milieu, this use reflected the tolerance of Ukrainian Churchmen trained in the humanistic school. The Orthodox Church recognizes neither Augustine nor Jerome as Saints, and is critical of Augustinian theology. Thus, the appearance of both Latin Church Fathers among Tuptalo's sources readily identifies the author's Kievan training. The inclusion of St. Jerome in Part One of Tuptalo's Minei was one of the features which incited Patriarch Joakim's disapproval of the work. See Ioann Kologrivov, Očerki po istorii Russkoj Svjatosti (Bruxelles [Brussels]: La Vie avec Dieu, 1961) 271.

[255]Tuptalo (13): говьютъ зѣло пред неприступнымъ свѣтом и пѣніе непрестанно вопіютъ.

[256]Tuptalo (123): херувимы, яко на васъ почилъ есть Христосъ!

Holy Trinity[257] is taken directly from the *eulogitaria* of *Orthros* (Matins). In the same sermon another liturgical reference is made to hymnography from the Service for Christmas Eve, in which the three gifts of the Magi are likened to faith, love, and good deeds.[258] Another quotation from sacred hymns is found in this sermon, in which the *heirmos* from the Canon of the Feast is quoted, in which the action of the Holy Spirit is likened to a fire which causes the dew of sin to vanish.[259] Numerous references to Church hymnography are found in the Dormition Sermon, where the Acathist(os) Hymn to the Theotokos is quoted three times. In the introduction to this sermon, a verse from the third ode of the hymn is quoted twice and provides the imagery of a fertile field, which serves as a metaphor for the Virgin Mary.[260] The third quotation from the Acathist(os) is taken from the *kontakion* of the Annunciation, which describes the angelic world prostrating itself before the Theotokos.[261] Yet another reference to Church music is found in this sermon, taken from a liturgical hymn which likens the wisdom of the three youths in the furnace of Babylon (Dan. 3:19-25) to that of the Cherubim.[262] References to Church Hymnography are also found in the Nativity Sermon. The theme of the sermon itself, that of the entire Universe being present in the Cave of the Nativity in Bethlehem, is quoted directly from the 9th *heirmos* of the Festal Canon.[263] Later in this same sermon, a reference is made to a hymn sung during the *lete* at vespers on the eve of the Feast of the Epiphany, which describes the arrival of Christ the King, accompanied by angelic hosts.[264]

---

[257]Tuptalo (26): Поклоньмся Отцу и его Синови и Святому Духу, святой Тройци.

[258]Tuptalo (29): вьру яко злато, любовь яко смирну, яко ливанъ дьяніа принесемъ Зиждителю.

[259]Tuptalo (40): избавленіе и очищенія грѣховъ огнедухновенную пріимьте росу, о чада свѣтообразная!

[260]Tuptalo (55,56): радуйся, браздо, растящее гобзованіе.

[261]Tuptalo (73): подъяша ю престолы и силы.

[262]Tuptalo (66): херувимомъ подобящеся отроци въ пещи.

[263]Tuptalo (76): Таинство странное вижду и преславно: небо сущу пещеру.

[264]Tuptalo (79): идьже царево пришествіе, тамо и чинъ его приходитъ.

In addition to Church Hymnography, another Patristic source used by Tuptalo is the Lives of the Saints. The Holy Spirit Sermon makes reference to the Life of St. Seraphima the Martyr.[265] In the St. Michael Sermon, a narrative describing the spiritual struggles of an unnamed Egyptian Hermit is also quoted.[266] In the Innokentij Gizel' Oration, the life of the deceased is likened to that of Blessed Agapitus the Deacon, who wrote letters condemning the Byzantine Emperor Justinian for his extravagance.[267] This same speech contains reference to the Life of St. John the Merciful, to whom Gizel' is compared. In addition to Byzantine Lives, Tuptalo also makes reference to the *Paterik* of the Kievan Caves' Monastery. An example of this is found, appropriately, in the Gizel' Oration, in which Gizel's service as an archimandrite is likened to that of the Monastery's founders, Saints Anthony and Theodosius.[268]

References to non-Bibilical, non-Patristic sources in Tuptalo's sermons are not numerous, and are generally drawn from historical texts. The St. Michael Sermon contains references to two icons of St. Michael found in the Church of Santa Maria degli Angeli in Rome (originally constructed as Diocletian's Baths) and the Byzantine Cathedral in the Sicilian capital of Palermo.[269] The Jewish historian, Josephus Flavius, is quoted in the Gizel' Oration,[270] and the same speech refers to an ancient inscription found on the tomb of a Roman citizen.[271] Classical Mythology is also used in the the Gizel' Sermon, in which the Archimandrite's support of Christ's Church is compared to the mythical figure of Atlas holding up

---

[265]Tuptalo (23): Спытано разъ святую мученицу Серафиму...

[266]Tuptalo (104): пустынник единъ въ сторонах Египетскихъ...

[267]Tuptalo (127): То свѣдчитъ ми блаженний Агапитъ, діаконъ, который, до царя Іустиніана пишучи, так мовитъ...

[268]Tuptalo (122): преподобные отцы наши, патронове того святаго мѣсца Антоній и Ѳеодосій...

[269]Tuptalo (100): святаго архистратига Михаила малюютъ мечемъ...по стѣнахъ церковнихъ ангельскаго храма въ столичномъ сицилійскомъ городѣ Панорміи, знакъ взявши съ куншътовъ ѳермъ, альбо бань Діоклитіановыхъ

[270]Tuptalo (114): Пишетъ историкъ жидовскій Іосифъ...

[271]Tuptalo (129): Едного часу въ Римѣ знайдено неякись давный каменемъ приваленный гробъ...

the universe.[272] Reference to Greek mythology is also found in the Holy Spirit Sermon, in which the pagan gods Venus, Mars, and Bacchus are used to personify lust, anger, and drunkenness.[273] Not only Greek mythology, but the pre-Christian beliefs of the Ukrainian people are also mentioned in this same sermon, when he likens the present-day Ukrainians' love of gold to their ancestors' worship of golden idols upon the hills of Kiev.[274] The use of secular material in Tuptalo's sermons, however, is minor. Biblical quotations far outnumber any other source, and Patristic writings clearly dominate over non-sacred texts. Tuptalo's application of *inventio* adheres to Galjatovs'kyj's requirement that the use of secular material in sermon writing is secondary to sacred writings.[275]

Tuptalo's application of *dispositio* faithfully adheres to the three *partes oratoriae* of *exordium* , *narratio* , and *conclusio* . He carefully follows Galjatovs'kyj's demand that all three parts be interrelated and that continuity of theme be maintained throughout the speech.[276] The Sermon on the Sixth Sunday after Pascha begins with a theme taken from the Sunday Gospel reading, " and this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God" (John 17:3).[277] The *narratio* develops the theme based on the concept that the only way to know God is through love.[278] The *conclusio* reiterates this idea, and again quotes the original passage from John's Gospel.[279]

---

[272]Tuptalo (124): а двигалъ, яко другій Атлясъ...

[273]Tuptalo (20): тьлесноть назвавши Венерою, гньвъ - Марсомъ, пянство - Бахусомъ.

[274]Tuptalo (20): Отожъ маешь идола, злато, не на яковомъ холмѣ горъ кіевскихъ, але в шкатулѣ, въ скринѣ, въ коморѣ.

[275]cf. Galjatovs'kyj (519).

[276]cf. Galjatovs'kyj (513).

[277]Tuptalo (1): Се есть животъ вѣчный, да знаютъ Тебе Единаго истиннаго Бога.

[278]Tuptalo (6): А то жъ явно, же тотъ тылько Бога добрѣ знаетъ, хто его любитъ.

[279]Tuptalo (9): Тако гды хто любовь правдивую въ сердцы своемъ до Бога мѣетъ, той запевне добрѣ Бога знаетъ, коштуетъ его любовію и знаетъ сердечною сладостію, яко благъ есть, и таковый власнѣ доступитъ живота вѣчнаго зъ познанія Бога походячого, по словеси Христову: се есть животъ вѣчный, да знаютъ Тебе единаго истиннаго Бога.

The Sermon on the Descent of the Holy Spirit does not take its theme from the Gospel Reading of the Feast (Matt. 18:10-20), but instead from the prayer of the Doxology, "Glory to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit."[280] The *narratio* is divided into three sections, each one describing how to glorify one of the Persons of the Holy Trinity. The Father is to glorified through prayer,[281] the Son is glorified through suffering,[282] and the Holy Spirit is glorified through purity.[283] The *conclusio* repeats the Doxology, ending with a prayer of glorification to the Holy Trinity.[284]

The theme of the Holy Trinity Sermon is similarly taken from a non-Biblical text, rather than from the Sunday Gospel (John 7:37-52). The theme quotes a verse from the *eulogitaria* of the Ressurection sung at Matins: "Let us worship the Father and His Son and His All-Holy Spirit - the Holy Trinity."[285] The *narratio* is divided into three sections, elaborating upon three different ways in which we are to worship the three Persons of the Trinity. We worship the Father with our soul,[286] the Son with our body,[287] and the Holy Spirit with our spirit.[288] The third section on the worship of the Holy Trinity comprises the *conclusio* .

The sermon for the 27th Sunday after Pentecost takes its theme from the Sunday Gospel Reading, which describes Jesus' healing of a crippled

---

280Tuptalo (10): Слава Отцу и Сыну и Святому Духу.

281Tuptalo (17): Власнь теды Богу Отцу въ молитвь нашей благоговьинство прислушаетъ.

282Tuptalo (19): Если теды хочемъ Сына Божіа въ тьлъ нашемь прославити, мьемъ же его прославити крестомъ, страданьми.

283Tuptalo (22): Чистотою убо теды маемъ Бога Духа Святого прославляти.

284Tuptalo (25): слава Отцу, и Сыну, и Святому Духу. Слава Богу Отцу, сьдящему на престолъ славы своея! Слава Богу Сыну, преклоншему небеса и сошедшему на землю! Слава Богу Духу Святому, вездь сущему и вся исполнящему!

285Tuptalo (26): Поклоньмся Отцу и его Сынови и Святому Духу, святой Троици.

286Tuptalo (29): То поклонъ Богу Отцу, а поклонъ той будетъ отъ души нашей.

287Tuptalo (38): Такъ теды и нашъ поклонъ, отъ тьла нашего бываемый Богу Сыну.

288Tuptalo (42): Отъ духа нашего поклонъ Святому Духу.

woman on the Sabbath (Luke 13:11-17). The *narratio* elaborates upon the idea that if one wishes to receive God's mercies, it is first necessary to approach Him in love and repentence.[289] The *conclusio* consists of a prayer, beseeching the Lord Jesus Christ to show His abundant mercies upon us.[290]

The theme of the Dormition Sermon is not taken from the Gospel reading of the Feast (Luke: 10:38-42,11:27-28), but instead from another Gospel text, "and He will gather the wheat into his garner" (Matt. 3:12, Luke 3:17).[291] The *narratio* describes the life of the Theotokos, likening it to field of wheat which brings forth an abundant harvest.[292] The *conclusio* repeats the wheat metaphor, and offers a hymn of praise to the Theotokos.[293]

Tuptalo's choice of theme for the Nativity Sermon is also original. Instead of the Gospel Reading (Matt. 2:1-12), Tuptalo introduces a theme which quotes the 9th *heirmos* of the Canon for the Feast, which is also sung during the Divine Liturgy in place of the *Axion esti* ("It is fitting and right to call you blessed, O Theotokos"): "I behold a mystery, a strange and

---

289Tuptalo (47): Тыхъ только Господь человѣколюбивыми зритъ очима, которыи приближаются ему сердцемъ, а далеко отстоящимъ, зъ блуднымъ сыномъ удаляющихся на страну далече, хоць и видитъ всевидящимъ очима на ихъ, человѣколюбными еднакъ и милосердными очима на ных не поглянетъ и якобы не дозритъ.

290Tuptalo (54): Радуемся и мы о тебѣ, Господь нашемъ, Христе Спасителю нашъ, а молимъ твою благость: покрый насъ и отъ сонма и оружіа враговъ нашихъ видимыхъ и невидимыхъ, во вся дни живота нашего, уврачуй душевныя и тѣлесныя недуги наши, и вѣчнаго угодившихъ тебѣ наслѣдія не лиши насъ!

291This text is read during the Divine Liturgy on the Eve of the Feast of the Epiphany; it quotes the words of St. John the Baptist, prophesizing the Arrival of the Messiah. Its choice as a theme for the feast of the Dormition, however, is hardly inappropriate. This Feast, which falls on August 15 (28), coincides with the harvest period in Ukraine. Much of Ukrainian folklore surrounding this holiday is rich in harvest imagery. See Stepan Kylymnyk: Ukrains'kyi rik u narodnix zvyčajax v istoryčnomu osvitlenni vol. 5 (Winnipeg: Trident Press, 1962) 95-107.

292Tuptalo (56): Нива, яко мовится, есть шестьдесятолѣтное житіе пречистыя Богородицы, маючая своя бразды, свои части, на которихъ класы ей добріи, а надъ всѣхъ святыхъ Богу пріятньйшіи дѣла.

293Tuptalo (74): Отдаемъ должный поклонъ и мы вси тебѣ, о пренебесная хлѣба животнаго пшенице...

wonderful mystery: the cave has become heaven."[294] The *narratio* elaborates upon the Mystery of the Incarnation, expressing wonder at God's Son being born of a Virgin, and having chosen the cave in Bethlehem as His dwelling place.[295] The *conclusio* repeats the theme of "a mystery, a strange and wonderful mystery" which offers Salvation to all the universe.

The Saint Michael Sermon is the most complicated of all the sermons in regard to theme. In the year 1697, this Church holiday fell on the 23th Sunday after Pentecost, thus giving Tuptalo the opportunity to construct his sermon around two themes, one for the Sunday and one for the Feastday. The Gospel reading for the Sunday is taken from Luke 8:26-39, which describes the healing of the Gadarene demoniac.[296] The theme for the Feastday comes from the book of Revelation, describing the war in Heaven between St. Michael and his Angels against the dragon (Rev. 12:7).[297] Tuptalo's *narratio* skillfully intertwines the two themes: Jesus' struggle against the multitude of demons which possess the Gadarene is not only identified with St. Michael's war against the dragon, but the two events are described as one, transposing differences of time and setting. The two narratives are combined to present a discourse on how seven kinds of virtue may defeat the seven evils which exist in the world. The *conclusio* glorifies the triumph of Jesus over the demons, of St. Michael over the dragon, of goodness over evil.

The theme of the Gizel' Oration is taken from the book of Sirach: "he will be widely praised for his wisdom, and it will never be lost, because people for generations to come will remember him. The Gentiles will talk about his wisdom, and he will be praised aloud in the assembly" (Sir. 39:9-10).[298] The *narratio* continues with a eulogy to Gizel',

---

[294]Tuptalo (76): Таинство странное вижду и преславно: небо сущу пещеру.

[295]Tuptalo (79): Небо престолъ есть Божій, а и въ пещеръ Богъ сѣдитъ на престолѣ святѣмъ своемъ, на рукахъ дѣвическихъ.

[296]Tuptalo (93): Пришедшу Ісусови въ страну Гадаринскую...

[297]Tuptalo (93): Михаилъ и ангелы его брань сотвориша съ зміемъ.

[298]Tuptalo (108): Не отъидетъ память его, и имя его поживетъ въ родъ и родъ, премудрость его повѣствуютъ языци, и хвалу его исповѣсть церковь.

praising his wisdom and service to God. The speech concludes with an imaginary dialogue between Saints Anthony, Theodosius, and the other Fathers of the Caves' Monastery, in which they call out to Gizel', commending him for his lifelong service to the monastery, and inviting him to partake of his heavenly reward.[299] In this manner, as in all his other sermons, Tuptalo carefully ensures that unity of theme is maintained througout the oration, from *exordium* , to *narratio* , and finally to *conclusio* .

Tuptalo's *elocutio* , like that of Galjatovs'kyj, tends toward the stylistic median of *delectare* .[300] For example, in his Holy Spirit Sermon, he presents the question of "In what manner are we to praise God the Father?"[301] He develops this theme by resorting to the technique of similarities. He starts by offering simple advice, that "if one desires to learn how to do something , one must have a example to follow: an artist has his model before himself; an architect, his plans."[302] He then explains that the example by which to learn appropriate glorification of God the Father is that of the Seraphim, who stand before His Throne and offer songs of praise.[303] Following this simple instruction, Tuptalo then proceeds to elaborate upon the image of the Seraphim as metaphor for the Church offering praise to God. Each Seraph has six wings, two of which cover his face, two of which cover his feet, and two of which are used to fly before the Throne of the Father. The symbolic gestures of each Seraph are then associated with mystical experience: the covering of the face

---

299Tuptalo (133): Буди тебѣ память вѣчная и въ небѣ посредѣ преподобныхъ и богоносныхъ отецъ нашихъ Антонiа и Θеодосiа и прочихъ отецъ печерскихъ, абысь тамъ слышалъ завше таковый привѣтъ...

300cf. Galjatovs'kyj (517,516).

301Tuptalo (11): А як скутечне славити Бога должни...

302Tuptalo (13): Хто хочетъ яковаго научитися ремесла, смотритъ на образецъ, на зразъ и на кшталтъ того дѣлаетъ: маляръ маетъ куншту предъ собою, а будовичной - абрисъ.

303Tuptalo (13): Хто хочешь Бога славити благоговѣйно, що бы могли быти на твоей души збудованiе, а то маешь куншту, то абрисъ: шестокрылнiи серафими коло Божiаго престола.

represents humility,[304] the covering of the feet symbolizes purity,[305] and the flight before the Throne of the Father represents prayer and contemplation of the Divine Nature.[306] In this manner, Tuptalo takes a familiar image, well-known to his listeners through the vehicles of sacred art and scripture, then introduces his point by means of a simple explanation, and then delights his audience through an imaginative use of associations.

Other examples of this inventiveness may be found in these sermons. The Dormition Sermon takes another image familiar to his audience, a field of wheat, and associates this with the life of the Theotokos. Tuptalo divides his field into 5 furrows and associates each furrow with a period in the subject's life. The first furrow is her childhood,[307] the second is the period from her betrothal to the birth of her Son,[308] the third leads up to the Crucifixion,[309] the fourth is her sufferings beneath her Son's

---

[304]Tuptalo (14): Двохъ крилъ треба, да лицы закрыемъ, и тыми быть разумѣти можемъ завстыданеся (sic) предъ Богомъ своихъ грѣховныхъ спросностей и смиреніе, тое альбовѣмъ обое умѣетъ лицо закрывати человѣку.

[305]Tuptalo (15): гды до благоговѣинства въ славословіи Божомъ на закрытіе ногъ нашихъ возмѣмъ себѣ за крыла двое сіе: познанье подлости своей и опасство и острожность надуфаня въ себѣ самомъ...

[306]Tuptalo (17): Еще жъ двоих крилъ треба до летанья, а тыми суть у святаго Назіанзена дѣяніе и видѣніе, то есть, акціа и контемпляціа, простѣй мовячи - подвигъ въ молитвѣ и богомысльность, альбо вниманіе въ молитвѣ...

[307]Tuptalo (56): На початку вступѣмъ до первой пресвятаго ея житья бразды, альбо части, которая починается отъ дому святых правѣдныхъ родителей Іоакима и Анны, и идетъ чрезъ церковь Соломонову, а терминъ ей обрученіе.

[308]Tuptalo (62): Зъ первой пресвятаго житіа Богородична бразды поступимъ до другой; а тая есть въ кровъ Іосифовъ, въ дому Іосифомъ; починается отъ Соломоновой церкви, а термѣнъ ей ажъ во Виѳлеемѣ въ вертепѣ.

[309]Tuptalo (65): Отъ Виѳлеема починается третяя бразда пресвятого Богородичнаго житія, а идетъ чрезъ Египетъ, зъ Египту до Назарету поворотъ чинитъ и сягаетъ ажъ подъ гору Голгоеску близко.

Cross,[310] and the fifth is her glorification among the Apostles following the Resurrection and Ascension.[311] The association continues, with the five periods of her life corresponding to the five letters of her name, MARIA. The letter M stands for "Mudraja Děva" ("a Wise Virgin"), the letter A for "Agnica Xristova" ("Lamb of Christ"), the letter R for "Raba Gospodnja" ("Handmaid of the Lord"), the letter I for "Istočnik Žizni" ("Source of Life"), and the final letter A for "Apostolom Věnec" ("Crown of the Apostles"). In this manner, a very simple image drawn from the theme of harvest, is amplified into a discourse concerning the history of Salvation.

Also, consider the Nativity Sermon. The image he presents his listeners with is again a familiar one, drawn from sacred art: the Icon of Christ's Nativity, in which the Child and his Mother occupy the central space of the Cave, and in the space surrounding the Cave are found St. Joseph, Angels, Shepherds, Wise Men, the ox, and the ass. Tuptalo then presents his listeners with a paradox, "How can it be that all of heaven, the sun, moon, stars, and everything within them, is found inside this cave?"[312] From this point, he develops a series of elaborate associations based on three levels of heavenly existence. On the lowest level, the Cave in Bethlehem contains all representatives of the created order (e.g. shepherds, Wise Men, animals, etc.)[313] On the middle level, heaven is represented by the Theotokos, whose womb has become a throne for the Second Person of the Holy Trinity.[314] On the highest level, heaven is

---

310Tuptalo (68): Четвертая бразда пресвятого житіа Богородичина на Голгоѳь подъ крестомъ.

311Tuptalo (69): Пятая остатная пресвятаго житья Богородична бразда отъ горы Голгоѳскія, идетъ подъ гору Олѣвную до Геесиманіи.

312Tuptalo (77): Еднымъ словомъ выявилися секрета Божіи, таинства; спѣваетъ нынѣ церковь: таинство странно вижду и преславно. А еще чировныи секрета? Цѣлое небо, зъ солнцемъ, мѣсяцемъ, зъ звѣздами, та зо всѣмъ маестатомъ Божіимъ втиснулося въ едину щуплую Виѳлеемскую пещеру: небо сущу пещеру.

313Tuptalo (83): Першое нижшое небо будь Виѳлеемская пещера.

314Tuptalo (83): Другое вышшое небо - пречистая и преблагословенная Дѣва.

represented by Jesus Christ, in whose Person the Heavenly and earthly worlds are united, two natures, Divine and human, becoming one.[315]

In addition to the basic rhetorical elements of *inventio* , *dispositio* , and *elocutio* , Tuptalo's work contains numerous features of epideictic speech, including eulogistic aim, the use of episodic argumentation, the object of Christian virtue, freedom of structure, and great attention to ornamentation. Although it is impossible to completely identify all elements of ceremonial discourse in these eight sermons, examples may be selected which help to demonstrate Tuptalo's application of the principles of epideictic speech.

The eight sermons found in Titov's collection allow us to see examples of the three types of sacred oration discussed in Galjatovs'kyj's "Nauka": Sermons for Sundays (i.e. Tuptalo's Sermons for the 6th Sunday after Pascha and for the 27th Sunday after Pentecost), for Feastdays of the Lord (i.e. Descent of the Holy Spirit, the Holy Trinity, Nativity of Jesus Christ), of the Theotokos (Dormition Sermon), of the Saints (St. Michael Sermon), and for funerals (Gizel' Oration). This is in keeping with the eulogistic purpose of sermon writing, which is to magnify the praiseworthy actions of Jesus Christ, the Theotokos, the Saints, and other devout individuals.

As is typical of epideictic speech, Tuptalo's method of argumentation involves the use of episodic eulogy. Galjatovs'kyj advises the preacher to remind his listeners of the subject's virtues, of his or her good acts (*actiones humanas*), and of the miracles which give witness to his or her Holiness.[316] Tuptalo follows this advice, and in his sermons we find numerous examples of such argumentation. Two of the speeches, the Dormition Sermon and the Gizel' Oration, show particularly effective use of episodic eulogy.

The Dormition Sermon is essentially a eulogistic narration, dividing the Life of the Theotokos into five periods, and describing the various good acts associated with these periods. Her childhood is described under the heading of "Mudraja Děva", alluding to the ten wise virgins of

---

315Tuptalo (83): Третее - найвышшое емпирейское небо, бо оттоль сошедый Богъ воплощенный въ дитинномъ тѣлѣ.

316cf. Galjatovs'kyj (515).

Matthew's Gospel (Matt. 25:1-13). Just as Matthew's wise virgins were ready for the arrival of the bridegroom, Tuptalo describes the childhood of his subject as a period of preparation for her service to God, through her purity of body and soul.[317] The narrative of this sermon continues, now under the title of "Agnica Xristova," alluding to John the Baptist's proclamation of Jesus as the Lamb of God (John 1:29). If Jesus is the Lamb of God, then the Theotokos is the she-lamb who gives birth to Him. In this manner Tuptalo amplifies the second period of the Virgin Mary's life, during which she consents to give birth to God's Son, permitting the world to participate in His Kingdom.[318] The narrative proceeds into the third period, "Raba Gospodnja," echoing Mary's own words, "Se raba Gospodnja..." (Luke 1:38). Tuptalo then gives various episodes from subject's life, describing her many good deeds, in which she served God as an earthly Mother, and as a spiritual daughter.[319] The fourth section of the narrative, called "Istočnik Žizni", celebrates the Theotokos' ultimate role in Salvation History, as the vehicle by which Eternal Life is made available to humanity. Tuptalo vividly places his audience at the scene of Crucifixion: Jesus hangs upon the Cross, his blood flowing as a Fountain of Immortality. his mother stands beneath the Cross and weeps, for she is the flesh by which God's Son fashioned for himself a Body, a Body which is now broken upon the Cross, for the remission of sins. Thus are two sources of Life present upon Golgotha: the Dying Saviour, and his Mother. Jesus' Blood and Mary's tears flow together to wash away sin, the Son offering his Flesh as a Sacrifice, and his Mother offering her love and humility, without which the Sacrifice of her Son would not have been possible.[320] The fifth and final episode from the life of the Theotokos is

---

317Tuptalo (61): Учитъ Мудрая Дѣва своимъ прикладомъ и чистоты, а чистоты сугубой, внѣшнѣй и внутрней, тѣлесной и душевной.

318Tuptalo (63): агница, рожшая агница, внетъ приходитъ на мысль крѣпость, и сила, и слава, и царство Агнца.

319Tuptalo (68): Такъ высоко класъ служебничества рабы Господней въ працахъ около выкормленя отрока божественнаго Христа, такъ высоко вырослъ, же засталъ дщерію Божіею.

320Tuptalo (68): Обы два тыи пренансвятѣшін источники омывали болото грѣховъ нашихъ, овъ кровью, овъ слезами. Источникъ Христосъ во изліанін своея крове приносилъ Богу Отцу о насъ жертву, за ны пожреся Христосъ. Источникъ Маріа, во изліанін

her presence among the Apostles at the Ascension, at which moment Tuptalo gives her the name, "Apostolom Vĕnec." At this last moment, the subject takes her place of Glory in the Church, and she is exalted not only among, but above the Apostles. Tuptalo magnifies her as an mankind's intercessor before God, and as a source of hope and comfort for all believers.[321]

A eulogistic approach to argumentation is similarly evident in Tuptalo's Gizel' Oration, in which the preacher constantly makes reference to the deceased's acts of service to the Caves' Monastery and to the Church. Gizel' is lauded as a pastor, preacher, and spiritual guide, whose words of wisdom and good acts served as an inspiration to his brethren.[322] Gizel' is also praised for his many charitable acts towards the poor, the sick, and other suffering individuals. Tuptalo structures the eulogy in an elaborate manner: Gizel's good acts serve as a pillar in God's Temple (i.e. the Church), and his charitable acts are likened to the blossoms of lilies (in Church Slavonic: "krin") from which this spiritual pillar, which is like porphyry, is fashioned.[323] As further testimony to Gizel's praiseworthiness, Tuptalo draws attention to the great honor which is given to the subject following his death, likening the hymns of the multitude of

---

слезъ своих зъ жертвою духа тужъ стояла, - жертва Богу духъ сокрушенъ.

[321]Tuptalo (69): Во всѣхъ тыхъ скорбныхъ печалехъ святымъ апостоломъ едина была утѣха, отрада, притомность въ тѣлѣ пречистыя, преблагословенныя Дѣвы, на которую, по свидѣтельству многихъ, бы кто и наискорбнѣйшій спозрѣлъ, веселіа духовнаго исполнися.

[322]Tutptalo (124): Его учителныхъ словесъ слухаючи, немощный яко лекарствомъ посилялся; на его добродѣтелное житіе взираючи, братъ кождый, яко о столпъ, опирался и будовался: его отческую милость къ себѣ видячи, яко лоза виноградная коло своего держался; ему, яко овечка, пастырю своему послѣдуючи, доволно пищею духовною питался.

[323]Tuptalo (128): Признаете, ласки ваши, же нынѣ поминаемый высоцѣ превелебный его милость архимандритъ тые крины имѣнія садилъ обфите въ полю, въ рукахъ убогихъ; гойный былъ ялмужникъ, здобился тотъ духовный столпъ криновымъ цвѣтомъ, яко порфирою яковою, гды такъ былъ милостивъ на убогіе.

brethren who stand about his grave to the many flowers of a wreath by which the late Archimandrite receives a glorious crowning in Heaven.[324]

Along with the use of episodic argumentation, another epideictic feature of Tuptalo's sermons which closely follows Galjatovs'kyj's homiletical theory is the use of Christian virtues as the object of the speech. A good example of this is found in the St. Michael Sermon, in which the author presents a battle between the forces of good and evil. Goodness is represented by three characters - Jesus Christ in the story of the Gadarene demoniac, the Seven-horned Lamb of the Apocalypse, and St. Michael. Evil is personified by the demons who possess the Gadarene, by the Apocalyptic seven-headed dragon and by the devils against whom Michael and his angels do battle.

Tuptalo begins by using the Gadarene narrative to show the presence of seven deadly sins in the world. He does this by atomizing the narrative into seven components, and then associating each component with a particular sin. Firstly, the demoniac wanders about the hills (Mark 5:5), avoiding the lowland settlements. Tuptalo associates the demoniac's love of high places with the sin of pride.[325] The second feature of the narrative which demands our attention is the demoniac's preference to live in tombs (Luke 8:27); this represents uncleanliness.[326] The third element is the demoniac's refusal to wear clothing (Luke 8:27). Tuptalo associates this with gluttony, or drunkenness, recalling the story of Noah who became

---

[324]Tuptalo (131): И тутъ при гробѣ нынѣ поминаемаго въ блаженной памяти преставьшагося, его милости господина отца и пастыря нашего, вижу уплетаючіеся вѣнцы и посипуючіеся цвѣти. Высоцѣ въ Богу превелебный его милость господинъ отецъ архимандритъ съ превелебными ихъ милостьми отцами игуменами Кіевскими и со всѣми отцами и братіами, Гды коло того жалобнаго катафалку станутъ, по обычаю церковному окружаючи вколо, то будетъ вѣнецъ по писанному: окрестъ его вѣнецъ братій; почнутъ панахидныи пѣти гимна, то будутъ цвѣты.

[325]Tuptalo (102): Въ горахъ бѣ вопія: то знакъ перваго грѣха смертнаго - гордости.

[326]Tuptalo (102): Живяще во гробѣх: то знак втораго грѣха смертнаго - нечистоты.

drunk on wine and uncovered himself (Gen. 9:21).[327] The fourth component is the inability of anyone to control the demoniac (Mark 5:4); this represents greed.[328] The fifth narrative element is the the man's ability to destroy the iron chains and fetters which are placed on him (Luke 8:29); this symbolizes anger.[329] The sixth incident involves the demoniac tearing at his own body with stones (Mark 5:5). Tuptalo associates these stones with jealousy, which drives people to inflict painful wounds of gossip and slander on one another.[330] The final component is the man's refusal to live in a human dwelling (Luke 8:27); this represents sloth.[331]

Tuptalo's discourse on Christian ethics in this sermon does not end with these elements taken from the Gadarence story. The moral elaboration of the speech continues, based on the second theme taken from the Apocalypse narrative of the Archangel Michael and his Host fighting against the demons. Tuptalo associates the seven deadly sins personified by the Gadarene demoniac's behaviour with the seven heads of the dragon found in the book of Revelation (Rev. 12:2). In opposition to the dragon is the Lamb with Seven Horns, representing Christ. The orator takes his associations even further, explaining that just as the seven heads of the dragon symbolize the seven deadly sins of pride, uncleanliness, gluttony, greed, anger, jealousy, and sloth, so likewise do the seven horns of the Lamb correspond to seven virtues. Tuptalo then describes these seven virtues by means of yet another association with the seven Archangels who fight in St. Michael's Apocalyptic war against evil. The first Archangel is Michael, who carries a two-edged sword, one blade representing knowledge of God, and the other representing the knowledge of ones' self having been created by God. Thus, knowledge of God and of God's

---

[327]Tuptalo (102): Въ рызу не облачашеся: то знакъ третьяго грѣха смертнаго - обжирства, жарлоцтва, піянства, которое и праведнихъ Ноевъ обнажати умѣетъ.

[328]Tuptalo (102): Никтоже можаше минути путемъ тѣмъ: то знак четвертаго грѣха смертнаго - лакомства.

[329]Tuptalo (103): Растерзая узы желѣзныя: то знакъ пятаго грѣха смертнаго - гнѣва.

[330]Tuptalo (103): Толча каменіемъ: то знакъ грѣха шестаго смертнаго - зависти.

[331]Tuptalo (103): Въ храмѣхъ не живяше: то знакъ седмаго грѣха смертнаго - лѣнивства.

Creation is the means by which the first head of the dragon, personifying the sin of pride, is severed.[332] The second Archangel, Gabriel, carries a lantern in his hand, representing purity of soul, the light of which causes the unclean darkness to disappear, thus severing the second head of the dragon.[333] The third Angelic hero is Raphael, the healer from the Book of Tobit (Tob. 3:17). The medicine which he brings is self-denial, achieved through fasting, and by which the third head of the dragon, that of gluttony, is destroyed.[334] The next angel to appear is Uriel, whose opponent is the fourth head of the dragon - gluttony. The weapon by which he destroys this sin is love and knowledge of Jesus Christ, by which the Christian may mortify the desire for material comforts.[335] The fifth Archangel is Selathiel, who offers prayer as a weapon by which to destroy the fifth head of the dragon - anger.[336] The sixth angelic victor is

---

[332]Tuptalo (103): Святый архистратигъ Михаилъ, чести и славы Божой оборонца, тхнетъ по зміевой той главѣ отмстителнимъ мечемъ, обоюду остроимъ, который зъ едной стороны наощренъ познаніемъ Бога творца своего, зъ другой стороны наощренъ познаніемъ себе, же суть створеніе создателю.

[333]Tuptalo (104): Стаетъ противъ той нечистой головы святый Гавріилъ...а стаетъ зъ свѣтлою (яко въ ночи) лихтарнею, тму вшетеченства отгоняющею, а якобы на грѣху застаючи, обличаючи, громячи, завстизаючи, и казнь наносячи, оразъ и съ презорчистымъ стает звѣрцадломъ, абы тое шкаредное головиско, якъ зразливый базѣлешекъ свою въ зѣрцадлѣ шпѣтность увидѣвши само отъ своего взорку здохло...а твоего смроду отворочаются вси ціломудредныи, душу свою въ тѣлѣ, якъ свѣчку въ лихтарнѣ, тьмою нечистоты непомраченную, заховати усилуючи, а въ сумнене свое чистое, якъ въ зерцадло.

[334]Tuptalo (105): восхити Рафаилъ демона...а тым поступкомъ кождого учитъ: кладе сердце твое на жаристое угліе любве Божія, а вилготность тѣла твоего страстную высушь, выпаль воздержаніемъ, постомъ.

[335]Tuptalo (105): Четвертый аггелъ святый Уріилъ, служитель божественныя любве, на тую голову добываетъ меча а оразъ и огня...и меч и огнь то сут любве божественныя знаки. Кто мѣетъ сердце свое любовію Божіею уязвленное, яко мечемъ, кто мѣетъ сердце свое желаніемъ Бога распаленное, яко огнемъ.

[336]Tuptalo (106): Стаетъ противъ той зміевой яростной головы святый Селаѳіилъ, выну къ Богу о родѣ человѣчестѣмъ моляйся, а

Jehudiel, who provides us with patience as the virtue by which the sin of jealousy is defeated.[337] The seventh and final Archangel to appear is Barachiel, who offers God's blessings and spiritual gifts as the means by which the seventh head of the dragon - sloth, is destroyed.[338] As the scent of flowers draws bees to gather pollen, gratitude for Divine gifts inspires the Christian to perform acts of spiritual fortitude. Thus Tuptalo's St. Michael Sermon lists seven virtues by which the seven deadly sins are vanquished: knowledge of God, purity of soul, self-denial, love and knowledge of Jesus Christ, prayer, patience, and remembrance of Divine Things.

Not only is the aim of Tuptalo's writing in keeping with Galjatovs'kyj's interpretation of epideictic speech, the structure of these sermons displays a flexibility of strategies which is also typical of ceremonial discourse. Tuptalo's choice of themes (see above) already demonstrates a great deal of variety and orginality in the introductions of these speeches: he draws from a wide selection of texts, sometimes taking his theme from the Gospel reading for a given Sunday or Feastday (e.g. Sermon on the 6th Sunday after Pascha, Sermon on the 27th Sunday after Pentecost, the St. Michael Sermon), sometimes from a different text of Scripture (Dormition Sermon, Gizel' Oration), and other times from non-Bibilical texts (Holy Spirit Sermon, Holy Trinity Sermon, Sermon on the Nativity of Christ). Such variety in the subject of a speech's introduction is permissible, in fact desirable, according to Galjatovs'kyj's theory.[339] Similarly, Tuptalo pays heed to Galjatovs'kyj's advice to never construct a

---

молитвами своими яко рѣкою огнь, ярость огнепалную вражію затопляетъ.

[337]Tuptalo (106): святый Егудіилъ завистную бѣсовскую голову, простираетъ десницу свою зъ вѣнцемъ златымъ, коронуючи тыхъ, которыи претерпѣваютъ крѣпко завистъ такъ отъ враговъ видимыхъ, отъ друговъ и сосѣдоъ враждебнихъ, яко и отъ враговъ невидимыхъ.

[338]Tuptalo (107): Семую голову зміеву седмаго грѣха смертнаго лѣности святый Варахіилъ запахомъ рожь бѣлыхъ, которыми суть благословенства и дарованіи Божіи человѣкомъ чрезъ руки его подаваемыи, тыми оную трунтъ и убиваетъ.

[339]cf. Galjatovs'kyj (516).

sermon without a theme, and to avoid substituting theme with a simple retelling of the Gospel narrative.[340]

When connecting the theme of the *exordium* to the *narratio*, Tuptalo again follows Galjatovs'kyj's advice that a direct correlation between the introduction of the speech and the narrative section works best.[341] All eight of the sermons demonstrate continuity between the theme text and the rest of the speech (see above). In none of the sermons do we find the case of theme being indirectly correlated between *exordium* and *narratio*. Furthermore, two of the sermons demonstrate Galjatovs'kyj's suggestion that the same theme, or a similar one may be used as the subject for two different sermons (e.g. Holy Spirit Sermon, Holy Trinity Sermon),[342] and that two themes may be used for one sermon (e.g. St. Michael Sermon).[343] In any event, Tuptalo carefully ensures that unity of theme is maintained in each sermon: whatever is presented in the *introductio* is elaborated upon in the *narratio*, and nothing new is introduced in the *narratio* which is not related to the theme of the *introductio*.

Tuptalo's sermons are extremely rich in the last element of Galjatovs'kyj's homiletical theory - ornamentation. Galjatovs'kyj suggests a number of techniques for attracting an audience's attention, such as the promising of new and unusual ideas, and the use of word play, apostrophe, *loci topici*, epithets, and metonymy. Tuptalo's orations display a wealth of ornament, clearly identifying him as an orator who has mastered the art of ceremonial discourse.

Tuptalo's love for wooing his audience with new and unusual ideas is particularly evident in four of the sermons: for the 6th Sunday after Pascha, for the Holy Spirit, for the 27th Sunday after Pentecost, and for the Nativity. In each of these, the preacher presents his listeners with a paradox, and then proceeds to give a solution to a seemingly impossible mystery.

An example of this is found in the Sermon for the 6th Sunday after Pascha. He places before us what appears to be two irreconcilable beliefs:

---

[340] cf. Galjatovs'kyj (516).
[341] cf. Galjatovs'kyj (514).
[342] cf. Galjatovs'kyj (514).
[343] cf. Galjatovs'kyj (516).

on one hand, in order to have eternal life, it is necessary to know God in faith and in love, but on the other hand, faith and love are not enough to know God.[344] What then is missing? Tuptalo solves the mystery by explaining that good works are the sign of true love, and without them, Eternal Life is unattainable. He quotes the first Epistle of John, "if a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar" (1 John 4:20), thus demonstrating that good works are essential in order to love God. He then presents his listeners with yet another problem: even though good works are essential to Salvation, not all people who perform good deeds will be saved. Why not? He compares two women from Scripture, Rahab the harlot (Josh. 2:1-12), and the sinful woman who anoints Jesus at the house of Simon the Pharisee (Luke 7:36-38). Rahab saves the lives of Joshua's spies in order to selfishly protect her own home, while the woman from Luke's Gospel bathes Jesus' feet with her tears, wiping them with her hair, for no motive other than love. Thus the solution is given: in order to find Salvation, faith must be accompanied by selfless acts of love performed only for the sake of God.[345]

Similar uses of paradox are used in other sermons in order to attract the audience's attention. The Holy Spirit Sermon presents us with the dilemma, "How is it possible to know God without putting Him to the test?"[346] Tuptalo solves this problem by explaining that it is futile to test God, for the only way to know Him is through faith.[347] The Sermon on the 27th Sunday after Pentecost describes the Prophet Elijah's condemnation of King Ahab of Gilead, in which he utters the words, "the Lord God of Israel liveth, before Whom I stand," (1 Kings 17:1). Tuptalo

---

344Tuptalo (1): першая - не кождый Бога добрь знаетъ, що черезъ вьру Его знаетъ; а затымъ не кождый вьрный христіанинъ доступитъ живота вьчнаго; другая, - тотъ тылько добрь Бога знаетъ, который Его при вьрь и любитъ, а любитъ правдивь, и тотъ только доступитъ живота вьчнаго.

345Tuptalo (7): Еще и то певной знакъ правдивой любви Божой, естли хто любитъ Бога для самого тылько Бога, а не для себе, то есть не для своей приваты, не для своего пожитку, не для заплаты.

346Tuptalo (11): А якожь...будемъ знати Бога, ежели о немъ... не будемъ испытовати?

347Tuptalo (12): не высокомудрствуй, но бойся; вьруй, славь, похланяйся благочестно, а не истязуй любопытно.

points out the paradox found in this statement: Elijah was standing before Ahab, not before the Lord, therefore his words do not make sense. The preacher unravels this dilemma by explaining that Elijah stood before the Lord in spirit, not in body.[348] The theme of the Sermon on the Nativity of Christ (see above) is also based on an unusual dilemma, that of how all the Universe may be contained within the Cave of Bethlehem. With typical style, Tuptalo explains how this ceases to be a paradox when it is placed within the realm of the spiritual, rather than the physical order of being.

Another ornamental technique used by Tuptalo is the use of word play, especialy the use of alliteration and other plays on word sounds such as rhymes. A particulary impressive use of this ornamental technique is found in the Dormition Sermon, in which the Theotokos is likened to a light (in Church Slavonic: "svět") and an elaborate play is made upon this one sound:

> Источникъ свѣта Маріа стала подъ крестомъ, абы заходящу солнцу, свѣтилу свѣта, на его мѣсци, яко свѣтопріимная свѣща, хоць тму просвѣщала; абы Богу умершу, не упалъ свѣтъ, она свѣтеніемъ своимъ вспирала. О свѣте нашъ Богородице! Просвѣщай тму нашу![349]

Numerous examples of wordplay may be found elsewhere in Tuptalo's sermons. The section of the Dormition Sermon entitled "Mudraja Děva" contains an alliteration of the sound "m": "Мудрая Дѣва, пречистая и преблагословенная Маріа, черезъ море міра житія своего теченіе мѣла."[350] This same sermon plays upon a rhyme between the word for "mud" (i.e. "blato") and the word for "gold" (i.e. "zlato") when it descibes the Theotokos in the following manner: "весь міръ як блато, она едина въ немъ злато." The St. Michael

---

348 Tuptalo (48): Стою, - мовитъ, - предъ Богомъ; живъ Господь, емуже предстою предъ нимъ: то есть: любъ тѣломъ есмь на земли, предстою лицу царя земного, але умъ мой, мысль моя, сердце мое самому на небесѣхъ сущему, на херувимскихъ престолѣхъ почивающему, предстоитъ Богу.

349 Tuptalo (69).

350 Tuptalo (61).

Sermon contains an alliteration based on the consonant "č": "чистый Пречистой Дѣвы пречистаго зачатія."[351] In his introduction to the Sermon for the 27th Sunday after Pentecost, we find a play on the syllables "dar" and "dor": "Слово Божіе...есть подаркомъ и дорогою. Есть подаркомъ, а ще надъ злото и дорогое каменье."[352]

Apostrophe is another ornamental technique which is frequently employed by Tuptalo. Throughout his sermons we find him calling out to Jesus Christ and to the Saints as if they were present in the building. In the Holy Spirit Sermon we find an elaborate apostrophe in which Tuptalo cries out to Jesus, and laments over the Saviour's agony in the Garden of Gethsemane:

> О, Христе, Спасителю нашъ! Ото Іюда уже близко зъ войскимъ (sic), со оружіемъ и дреколми, поймати тебе, зъ повязами связати тебе! Ото безчестіе Тебѣ тужъ! Ото уже готуютъ на тебѣ каторскіи инструмента - бичь, розги! Ото тешутъ дерево на крестъ на срочитную со злодѣи смерть. Ото внетъ злодѣи ковати на Тебе будутъ: аще не бы былъ сей злодѣй, не быхомъ его тебѣ предали: возми, возми, распни![353]

Another example of apostrophe is found in the Sermon for the 27th Sunday after Pentecost, when he implores the Prophet Elijah to explain the meaning of his words to King Ahab.[354] Not only does Tuptalo call out to Saints for advice, he also thanks them when assistance has been given, as in the case of the Sermon on the 6th Sunday after Pascha, when he thanks St. John Chrysostom for helping us to unravel the mystery of the knowledge of God.[355] In addition to Saints, we also find Tuptalo making apostrophe to individuals who have not been canonized, such as in the Gizel' Oration, when he calls out to the late Archimandrite, commending him for his

---

[351]Tuptalo (104).
[352]Tuptalo (43).
[353]Tuptalo (18).
[354]Tuptalo (48): святый пророче Иліе, що жъ ты мовишь?
[355]Tuptalo (5): Дякуемъ тебѣ, учителю святый, за науку.

service to the Caves' Monastery and celebrating his eternal memory in the Church Triumphant.[356]

Use of *loci topici* as a means of ornamentation has already been seen in the above analysis of the episodic structure of the Dormition Sermon and of the moral discourse found in the St. Michael Sermon (see above). The technique of atomization of a narrative into its component parts, and the extremely elaborate associations which are then drawn from these components, demonstrate Tuptalo's skill in the art of the Baroque Sermon. From the above analysis of episodic eulogy in the Dormition Sermon, it is seen how Tuptalo develops this sermon by means of various *loci topici* : he begins by atomizing the image of a field into five furrows; he then proceeds to associate these five furrows with five periods in the life of the Theotokos; he then associates these five periods with the five letters of her name; the five letters of her name then provide five titles (i.e. "Mudraja Děva", "Agnica Xristova", "Raba Gospodnja", "Istočnik Žizni", "Apostolom Věnec") by which she is exalted for her role in Salvation history. In developing the moral discourse found in the St. Michael Sermon (see above), the author again utilized a complex system of *loci topici* : the Gadarene narrative is atomized into seven components, which are then associated with seven deadly sins; St. Michael and six other Archangels are then associated with seven virtues; the author then turns his attention to the seven headed dragon of the Apocalypse, whose seven heads become associated with the seven deadly sins; likewise, the seven horned lamb from this same incident becomes associated with the same seven virtues represented by the Archangels.

Epithet and metonymy are also a part of Tuptalo's ornamental technique. Use of epithet may be seen in Tuptalo's Gizel' Oration, the theme of which is taken from the Book of Sirach, and concerns remembrance (Sir. 39:9). Tuptalo uses two different epithets to describe the concept of eternal remembrance, a pyramid and a pillar (in Church Slavonic: "stolp").[357] In the *narratio* , he describes various monuments

---

[356]Tuptalo (133): Буди тебѣ и во всей Россѣй церкви вѣчная память...

[357]Tuptalo (110): Пирамиду альбо столпъ ку вѣчной памяти въ Богу зешлому высоцъ превелебному его милости господину отцу Иннокентію Гизелю...

erected in memory of famous individuals,[358] all of which may be associated with the present honor given to the late Archimandrite.

Metonymy is also employed. An example of this is seen in the Dormition Sermon, where two metonymies are used in one sentence. The Virgin Mary is identified as a freshwater stream, and the world surrounding her is described as a salty ocean. In this manner, the purity of the Theotokos' life amid the evils of a sinful world, is likened to a stream of fresh water which preserves it's sweetness, even when flowing into the midst of a briny ocean.[359] This, along with the already mentioned examples of ornamentation found in these sermons, clearly identify the author as someone who has mastered the art of demonstrative oratory.

---

[358]Tuptalo (109): Ноево по потопѣ размноженное потомство, зебравши о томъ раду, мовитъ: пріидите, да созиждемъ себѣ градъ и столпъ, емуже верхъ будетъ до небесъ, и сотворимъ славно имя наше... Авессаломъ, втожъ прагнути вѣчной у людей памяти, поставилъ бѣ столпъ себѣ во удоли царствѣм...
Симонъ Маккавей, такъ же хотячи родичамъ и братамъ своимъ, тут тежъ и себѣ память учинити...

[359]Tuptalo (61): рѣкою была Мудрая Дѣва, пречистая и преблагословенная Маріа: чрезъ море міра житія своего теченіе мѣла...

Conclusion

Dymytrij Tuptalo's Ukrainian sermons are superb examples of the art of the Baroque sermon. The artful synthesis of humanistic strategies of expression with mystical content in his works places him among the most gifted writers of the Ukrainian Baroque. His practical application of the Classical principles of *inventio*, *dispositio* , and *elocutio* testifies to his sound humanistic training in the rhetorical theories of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian. His work demonstrates the important role that Latin school learning played in seventeenth century Ukrainian thought as well as the continuity of this tradition in the course of study at the Kievan Academy. Although doubtless well read in the works of Classical orators, Tuptalo, like many of his contemporaries, owed much to Ioannykij Galjatovs'kyj and his Kliuč Razumėnija. Galjatovs'kyj's homiletical theory represents the Christianization of Classical rhetoric in Ukrainian schools, based on a synthesis of Eastern Theology with the oratorical techniques of Classical Greece and Rome. Tuptalo's affinity with Galjatovs'kyj's theory is especially evident in the epideictic profile which reflects the wealth of compositional strategies recommended in Galjatovs'kyj's "Nauka, albo sposob zloženja kazanja." The eulogistic aim, the use of episodic argumentation, the object of Christian virtue, the structural freedom, as well as the great love for ornamentation expressed in these orations, demonstrate a practical application of the principles of ceremonial speech as presented in Galjatovs'kyj's theory. As teacher and mentor, Galjatovs'kyj's influence was instrumental in Tuptalo's development as an orator. Tuptalo's sermons fit squarely within the Kievan tradition of demonstrative speech, as articulated by Galjatovs'kyj.

Although a master of rhetoric, Tuptalo is above all a Christian pastor. In his sermons, he remains faithful to the primary purpose of his work, which is to save souls. In his work, we find an exquisite fusion of Christian content and humanistic form. As is evident from his sources for *inventio* , Tuptalo's work is firmly grounded in the mystical experience of the Eastern Church. Rhetorical principles serve as the framework for his sermons, while Christian theology provides him with his building material. The Christian content of his work does not limit him artistically. On the

contrary, it serves as an abundant source of associations by which he delights his audience. Like an iconographer, he remains within the perimeters of Church canons while simultaneously creating works of exquisite beauty. What he creates is not only dogmatically correct, it is also aesthetically appealing. Thus, in addition to being a talented preacher, he is also a gifted artist, incorporating a wealth of poetic imagery within an original redaction of themes drawn from sacred texts. This stylistic element of Tuptalo's work, unfortunately, lies beyond the scope of this thesis: his Ukrainian sermons beckon still further analysis in light of the author's talent as a poet, as well as an orator.

Bibliography

Allhouse, Robert, ed. Photographs for the Tsar - the Pioneering Color Photographyof Sergei Mikhailovich Prokudin-Gorskii. New York: The Dial Press, 1980.

Aristotle. Rhetoric. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1976.

Aristotle. Rhetoric to Alexander. London: William Heinemann.

Arxangel'skij, Aleksandr. Iz lekcij po istorii russkoj literatury. Kazan', 1913.

Askočenskij, Viktor. Kiev s drevnějšim ego učiliščem akademieju. Kiev, 1856

Baldwin, Charles. Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic. Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1959.

Barsov, E. "Slovo Svjatitelja Dimitrija, Mitropolita Rostovskago, v den' Svjatyja Trojcy." Čteni v Obščestvě istorii i drevnostej rossijskyx 2 (1884): 82-106.

Berndt, Michael. Die Predigt Dimitrij Tuptalos. Frankfurt: Peter Long, 1975.

Bida, Konstantyn. Ioanikij Galjatovs'kyj i joho Kliuč razuměnija. Roma [Rome]: Ukrainian Catholic UP, 1975.

Bulgakov, Metropolitan Makarij. Istorija kievskoj akademii. Sanktpeterburg [St. Petersburg], 1843.

Bulgakov, Metropolitan Makarij. "Sv. Dimitrija Rostovskago svjatitelja i čudotvorca, dogmatičeskoe učenie, vybranoe iz ego sočinenij." Xristianskoe čtenie, izd. pri Sanktpeterburgskoj Duxovnoj akademii 4 (1842): 467-469.

Cicero. De inventione. London: William Heinemann, 1959.

Cicero. Orator. Cambridge, 1885.

Cicero. Rhetorica ad Herennium. London: Harvard University Press, 1954.

Cicero Topica. London: William Heinemann, 1959.

Cope, Edward. The Rhetoric of Aristotle with a Commentary. Cambridge: 1877.

Corbett, Edward. Classical Rhetoric. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Čyževs'kyj, Dmytro. A History of Ukrainian Literature. Littleton: Ukrainian Academic Press, 1975.

Eding, Boris von. Rostov Velikij, Uglič - pamjatniki xudožestvennoj stariny. Moskva [Moscow], 1913.

Ejngorn, Vitalij. O snošenijax malorossijskago duxovenstva z Moskovskim Pravitelstvom v carstvovanie Alekséja Mixajloviča. Moskva [Moscow], 1890.

Galjatovs'kyj, Ioannykij. Kliuč razuměnija. Ed. I. Čepiha. Kyiv [Kiev]: Naukova Dumka, 1985.

Galaxov, Aleksej. Istorija russkoj sovesnosti drevnej i novoj. 2 vols. Sanktpeterburg [St. Petersburg], 1880.

Grabowski, Tadeusz. Historja literatury Polskiej. 2 vols. Poznań: Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk, 1936.

Kologrivov, Ioann. Očerki po istorii russkoj svjatosti. Bruxelles [Brussels]: La Vie avec Dieu, 1961.

Krynen, Jean. "Aperçus sur le Baroque et la Théologie Spirituelle." Baroque Revue Internationale 1 (1963): 27-35.

Kylymnyk, Stepan. Ukrajins'kyj rik u narodnix zvyčajax v istoryčnomu osvitlenni. 5 vols. Winnipeg: Trident Press, 1962.

Langsch, Johannes. "Zur Charakteristik Simeon Polockijs als Prediger." Kyrios 5 (1940/41): 82-130.

Maceevič, L. "Pol'skij propovědnik XVII věka Iezuit Foma Mlodzjanovskij." Trudy Kievskoj Duxovnoj Akademii 2 (1870): 103-113.

Markovskij, M. Antonij Radivilovskij. Južno-russkij propovědnik XVII v. Kiev, 1884.

Maxnovec', Leonid. Ukrains'ki pys'mennyky - bio-bibliohrafičnyj slovnyk. 5 vols. Kyiv [Kiev], 1960.

Mirkovič, Grigorij. O vremeni presuščestvlenija Sv. Darov. Vil'na [Vilnius], 1886.

Ohienko, Ivan (Metropolitan Ilarion). "Naučnyja znanija v 'Kliučě razuměnija' Ioannikija Galjatovskago, južno-russkago propovědnika XVII věka." Lětopis Ekaterinoslavskoj Gubernskoj Arxivnoj Komissii 10 (1914): 65- 96.

Ohienko, Ivan (Metropolitan Ilarion). Svjatyj Dymytrij Tuptalo - joho žyttja i pracja. Winnipeg: Christian Press, 1960.

Ohienko, Ivan (Metropolitan Ilarion). Ukrains'ka Cerkva za čas ruiny. Winnipeg: Ukrains'ke Naukove Pravoslavne Bohoslovs'ke Tovarystvo, 1956.

Nečaev, V. (Bishop Vissarion). Svjatyj Dimitrij, Mitropolit Rostovskij. Moskva [Moscow], 1910.

Nikolskij, Aleksandr. "Něskolko slov o žitii i sočinenijax svjatago Dimitrija Rostovskago." Izvěstija otdělenija russkago jazika i slovesnosti imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk 14 (1910): 160-171.

Novikova, Nina. "Poetika i ritorika v Kievo-Mogiljanskoj akademii." Russkaja reč 6 (1987): 93-97.

Peretc, Vladimir. Istoriko-literaturnyja izslědovanija i materialy iz istorii russkoj pěsni. Sanktpeterburg [St. Petersburg], 1900.

Petrov, Nikolaj. "Iz istorii Gomiletiki v staroj Kievskoj Duxovnoj Akademii." TrudyKievskoj Duxovnoj Akademii 1 (1866): 86-124.

Petrov, Nikolaj. Očerki z istorii ukrainskoj literatury XVII i XVIII v. Kiev: 1911.

Pětuxov, Evgenij. Russkaja literatura. Jur'ev, 1912.

Picchio, Riccardo. "The Impact of Ecclesiastic Culture on Old Russian Literary Techniques." Medieval Russian Culture. Ed. Henrik Birnbaum and Michael Flier. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Pitirim, Archbishop of Volokamsk, ed. The Orthodox Church in Russia. London: Thames and Hudson, 1982.

Porfir'ev, Ivan. Istorija russkoj slovesnosti. Kazan', 1879.

Poseljanin, E. Russkaja cerkov i russkie podvižniki. Sanktpeterburg [St. Petersburg], 1905.

Pypin, Aleksandr. Istorija russkoj literatury. 2 vols. Sanktpeterburg [St. Petersburg], 1907.

Quintilian. Institutio oratoria. London: William Heinemann,1952.

Rolland, Peter A. "'Dulce est et fumos videre Patriae' - Four Letters by Simiaon Polacki." Harvard Ukrainian Studies 9 (1985): 166-181.

Rožđestvenskij,Nikolaj. Spravočnik-ukazatel' pečatnyx opisanij slavjano-russkix rukopisej. Moskva [Moscow]: Akademija Nauk, 1963.

Sipovskij, Vasilij. Istorija russkoj slovesnosti. 2 vols. Sankpeterburg [St. Petersburg], 1911.

Sočinenija Svjatitelja Dimitrija, Mitropolita Rostovskago 4 vols. Moskva [Moscow], 1857.

Speranskij, Mixail. Istorija drevnei russkoj literatury. 2 vols. Moskva [Moscow]: Sabašnikov, 1921.

Stratij, Jaroslava. Opisanie kursov filosofii i ritoriki professorov Kievo-Mogiljanskoj Akademii. Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1982.

Strumins'kyj, Bohdan. "Pre-nineteenth Century Ukrainian." Apects of the Slavic Language Question. 2 vols. Ed. Riccardo Picchio and Harvey Goldblatt. Columbus: Slavica Publishers, 1984.

Sumcov, Nikolaj. "Ioannikij Galjatovskij." Kievskaja Starina 6 (1884): 1-201.

Sumcov, Nikolaj. Lazar Baranovič. Xar'kov [Xarkiv], 1885.

Sumcov, Nikolaj. O literaturnyx nravax južnorusskix pisatelei XVIII v. Sanktpeterburg [St. Petersburg], 1906.

Sumcov, Nikolaj. "Ioannikij Galjatovskij." Kievskaja Starina 6 (1884): 1-201.

Sydorenko, Alexander. The Kievan Academy in the Seventeenth Century. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1977.

Šljapkin, Ilija. Svjatitel Dimitrij Rostovskij i ego vremja. Sanktpeterburg [St. Petersburg], 1891.

Ternovskij, Filipp. "Mitropolit Stefan Javorskyj." Trudy Kievskoj Duxovnoj Akademii 1,3 (1864): 36-70, 237-290.

Titov, Andrej. Kelejnyj lětopisec Sv. Dimitrija Mitropolita Rostovskago. Moskva [Moscow], 1892.

Titov', Andrej. Propovědi Svjatitelja Dimitrija, Mitropolita Rostovskago, na ukrainskom narěčii. Moskva [Moscow]: 1909.

Titov, Andrej. Rostov Velikij i ego svjatyni. Sankpeterburg [St. Petersburg], 1895.

Titov, Andrej. "Svjatyj Dimitrij Mitropolit Rostovskij." Russkij Arxiv 2 (1895): 5-16.

Titov, Feodor. K istorii Kievskoj duxovnoj Akademii. Kiev, 1910.

Tolstoj, Mixail. Drevnija Svjatyni Rostova-Velikago. Moskva [Moscow], 1860.

Tračevskij, Aleksandr. Russkaja istorija. Sanktpeterburg [St. Petersburg]: 1895.

Vasilenko, Nikolaj. "Dimitrij Rostovskij i ego literaturnaja dějatel'nost'." Čtenija v Istoričeskom obščestvě Nestora Lětopisca 22 (1912): 80-83.

Vomperskij, Valentin. Ritoriki v Rossii XVII-XVIII vv. Moskva [Moscow]: Nauka, 1980.

Voznjak, Myxajlo. Istorija ukrains'koi literatury. 2 vols. L'viv, 1921.

Xarlampovič, Konstantin. Zapadnorusskija pravoslavnyja školy XVI i načala XVII věka. Kazan', 1898.

Xyžnjak, Zoja. Kyjevo-Mohyljans'ka akademija. Kyiv [Kiev]: Vyšča Škola, 1981.

"Zasědanie Černigovskoj gubernskoj učenoj arxivnoj kommissii, posvjaščenoj pamjati svjatitelja Dimitrija, Mitropolita Rostovskago." Trudy Černigovskoj gubernskoj učenoi arxivnoj kommissii 8 (1911): 1-47.

Appendix : Tuptalo's Sources for *Inventio*

Biblical quotations are divided into Old and New Testament. As is customary in the Slavic Bible, the deuterocanonical books of Baruch, 1 Maccabees, Sirach, Tobit, and Wisdom of Solomon are placed among the canonical Old Testament texts. Chapter and verse numbers are according to the Authorized (King James) Version. Scriptural quotes within each category are listed sequentially according to Titov's redaction of the sermons. Non-scriptural sources are given according to author along with reference page number from Titov's text. Only authors who are named by Tuptalo in his sermons are given.

1. Sermon on the Sixth Sunday after Pascha:

Old Testament	New Testament	Other Authors
Ps. 73:1	John 17:1-13	St. John Chrysostom (p. 2)
Ex. 19:18	Heb. 11:6	St. John Chrysostom (P.5)
Ps. 83:15	John 14:21	
Isa. 1:3	Heb. 11:6	
Ps. 34:8	Mark:16:16	
Josh. 2:12	1 Cor. 13:8	
Ps. 73:28	Heb. 12:29	
Ps. 73:28	Matt. 22:38	
1 Sam. 5:27	1 Cor. 2:8	
	1 John 4:20	
	1 John 2:15	
	Matt. 6:24	
	1 Cor. 2:9	
	1 Cor. 13:5	
	Luke 7:47	
	Matt. 5:6	
	John 14:23-24	

2. Sermon on the Descent of the Holy Spirit:

Old Testament	New Testament	Other Authors
Mal. 1:6	John 3:16	St. John Chrysostom (p. 12)
Ps. 2:11	John 1:12	St. John Chrysostom (p.13)
Mal. 1:6	John 15:13	St. Metrophanes (p. 13)
Isa 6:1-22	Cor. 11:12	St. John of Damascus (p.17)
Ps. 44:15	1 Cor. 6:20	St. John Chrysostom (p.18)
Gen. 18:17,23,27	John 17:3	St. John Chrysostom (p.20)
Ex. 6:5	Matt. 18:10	St. John Chrystostom (p.21)
Ps. 108:7	Luke 18:10	St. John Chrystostom (p. 21)
Gen. 6:3	Luke 18: 14	St. Isidore of Pelusium (p. 24)
Ps. 15:8	1 Cor. 10:12	
	1 Cor. 6:20	
	John 13:31	
	John 14:27	
	John 18:30	
	John 19:15	
	Luke 24:46	
	Heb. 2:9	
	Rom. 12:1	
	1 John 2:16	
	1 Cor. 6:20	
	2 Cor. 6:18	
	1 Cor. 6:15	
	Eph. 5.23	
	1 Cor. 6:19	
	1 Cor. 3:16	
	2 Cor. 6:16	
	1 Cor. 10:17	
	1 Thess. 4:3-5	
	Eph. 5:17	
	1 Cor. 15:41	
	1 Cor. 6:19-20	

3. Sermon on the Holy Trinity:

Old Testament	New Testament	Other Authors
Sir 5:4	Rev. 4:10-11	St. John of Damascus (p. 31)
Gen. 18:1-15	Matt. 22:20-21	
Ps. 119:72	Heb. 11:36	
Wisd. 3:6	Gal. 4:19	
Ps. 142:5	Matt. 21:22	
Isa. 45:3	Heb. 11: 33-35	
Ps. 73:1	Luke 19:38	
Ps. 45:7	2 Cor. 1:3-4	
Ps. 102:17	1 Cor. 1:23-24	
Ps. 82:6	John 16:22	
Ps. 52:8	Eph. 2:14	
Song. Sol. 5:14	John 1:14	
Ps. 38:4	Rom. 4:3	
Judg. 11:31	John 3:16	
Gen. 22:12	John 15:5	
Judg. 21:1	John 4:14	
Judg. 11:35	John 14:6	
Ps. 68:13	John 8:12	
Lev. 16:13	John 10:11	
Ps. 104:32	Matt. 26:31	
Ex. 3:2	I Pet. 1:18-19	
Ps. 18:30	Luke 22:29-30	
	Heb. 1:3	
	John 14:9	
	1 Pet. 2:24	
	Gal. 3:28	
	John 7:38	
	Matt. 11:27	
	Rom. 5:5	
	Rom. 1:9	

4. Sermon on the 27th Sunday after Pentecost:

Old Testament	New Testament	Other Authors
Ps. 119:127	Rom. 7:16-17	St. John Chrysostom (p. 50)
Ps. 119:32	Luke 13:26-27	St. Cyril of Alexandria (p. 50)
Jer. 13:23	2 Tim. 2:19	St. John Chrysostom (p. 50)
Ps. 139:3	Matt. 12:10,13	St. Stephan the Sabaite (p. 48)
Sir. 23:16	Matt. 12:14	
Ps. 119:16	Luke 13:17	
Ps. 34:16-17		
I Kings 17:1		
Ps. 16:8		
Ex. 4:2-4		
Ps. 82:6		
Song Sol. 8:6		
Ps. 64:3-4		

5. Sermon on the Dormition of the Theotokos:

Old Testament	New Testament	Other Authors
Ruth 2:2	Matt. 3:12	St. Gregory Nazianzen (p. 60)
Prov. 9:2-6	Luke 3:17	St. Germanus (p. 62)
Zech. 9:17	John 5:17	St. George of Nicomedia (p.62)
Ps. 104:22	Rev. 17:15	St. John of Damascus (p. 62)
Ex. 2:10	Rev. 5:13	St. Augustine of Hippo (p.66)
Ps. 33:11	1 Cor. 6:17	St. John of Damascus (p.66)
Ps. 124:4-5	John 19:27	St. Gregory of Neocaesarea (p.68)
Song Sol. 4:7	John 16:20	
Song Sol. 7:2	Acts 12:5	
Ps. 104:28		
Isa. 66:2		
Ps. 24:21		
Ezek. 10:3,18-19		
Jer. 5:15-16		
Isa. 38:5		
Isa. 62:3		
Gen. 27:27		
Gen. 37:7		

5. Sermon on the Dormition of the Theotokos:

Old Testament	New Testament	Other Authors
Ruth 2:2	Matt. 3:12	St. Gregory Nazianzen (p. 60)
Prov. 9:2-6	Luke 3:17	St. Germanus (p. 62)
Zech. 9:17	John 5:17	St. George of Nicomedia (p.62)
Ps. 104:22	Rev. 17:15	St. John of Damascus (p. 62)
Ex. 2:10	Rev. 5:13	St. Augustine of Hippo (p.66)
Ps. 33:11	1 Cor. 6:17	St. John of Damascus (p.66)
Ps. 124:4-5	John 19:27	St. Gregory of Neocaesarea (p.68)
Song Sol. 4:7	John 16:20	
Song Sol. 7:2	Acts 12:5	
Ps. 104:28		
Isa. 66:2		
Ps. 24:21		
Ezek. 10:3,18-19		
Jer. 5:15-16		
Isa. 38:5		
Isa. 62:3		
Gen. 27:27		
Gen. 37:7		

6. Sermon on the Nativity of Jesus Christ:

Old Testament	New Testament	Other Authors
Bar. 3:38	Luke 2:17	St. Augustine (p. 89)
Num. 24:17	Eph. 5:31	
Ezek. 1:1	Rev. 12:4	
Ps. 103:32	John 14:9	
Ex. 20:19	Rev. 4:10-11	
Ps. 149:6	Luke 2:13	
Ps. 45:9	2 Cor. 12:2	
Gen. 1:6	John 7:37-38	
Ps. 15:11	Matt. 20:28	
Jer. 4:8	John 15:14	
Ps. 22:15	John 15:13	
2 Sam. 14:14	Rom. 5:8	
Isa. 9:6	Phil. 2:6-7	
Ps. 88:16	John 3:16	
Ps. 5:11	Heb. 2:16	
Deut. 28:23	Rev. 19:6	
Ps. 67:6	1 John 5:19	
Isa. 55:10-11	Matt. 21:9	
	Luke 19:41	
	Luke 23:21	
	Luke 19:41-44	
	Jas 5:7	
	2 John 11:36	
	John 13:1	
	1 Cor. 2:19	
	1 Pet. 1:18-19	
	Luke 2:12	
	Col. 1:26	
	1 Tim. 3:16	
	Heb. 11:1	

7. Sermon on the Feastday of St. Michael the Archangel:

Old Testament	New Testament	Other Authors
Ps. 34:7	Luke 8:30	St. Theophilactus (p. 95)
Ps. 91:11	Rev. 12:7	St. Gregory the Decapolite (p. 95)
Ps. 33:8	1 Pet. 5:8	
Tob. 12:15	Luke 8:30	
Ps. 149:6	Luke 8:2	
Ps. 37:6	Rev. 1:4	
Ps. 90:13	Luke 8:26-27	
Ps. 36:8	Col. 3:18	
	Luke 8:37	
	1 Cor. 10:12	
	Eph. 6:12	
	Rev. 13:1	
	Rev. 5:6	
	Rev. 17:14	
	Rev. 5:6	
	Luke 21:34	
	Phil. 3:8	
	Rom. 8:35	
	1 Tim. 2:8	
	Matt. 25:34	

8. Oration on the Second Anniversary of the Death of Innokentij Gizel':

Old Testament	New Testament	Other Authors
1Macc. 3:3	Rev. 3:12	Josephus Flavius (p. 114)
Sir. 39:9-10	Rev. 1:15	St. Basil the Great (p. 122)
Ps. 112:6	Matt. 24:1	St. John Damascene (p. 125)
Gen. 11:4	1 John 2:18	St. Jerome (p. 131)
2 Sam. 11:4	2 Cor. 11:26	
Wisd. 8:13	2 Cor. 6:10	
Gen. 5:7	Jas. 1:2	
Ps. 31:10	Rom. 6:12	
Ps. 31:7	1 Cor. 7:31	
Hab. 3:17-19	1 Cor. 9:27	
Hab. 3:19	Col. 3:3	
Ps. 73:7	Luke 12:19	
Ps. 37:36	Heb. 11:1	
Ps. 102:4	1 Tim. 4:12	
Judg. 20:40	Rom. 15:1	
Song Sol. 8:10	Matt. 11:28	
1 Sam. 16:12	Matt. 11:29	
Prov. 22:1	Rev. 10:9	
Ps. 10:9	Matt. 6:28,30, 29	
Ps. 50:16	Luke 18:16	
1 Kings 7:19	Rev. 17:15	
Sir. 24:27-28, 34	Matt. 6:6	
Song Sol. 2:2	2 Tim. 4:7-8	
Song Sol. 2:1	Rom. 2:10	
Eccles. 11:1-2	Acts 10:3	
Song Sol. 2:3		
Sir. 39:9-10		
Ps. 22:14		
Song Sol. 8:6		
Ps. 137:5-6		
Sir. 49:1-2		
Sir. 45:1-2		